Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-104
Thursday
30 May 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-104 *30 May 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Last SS-20 Launching Pad Scrapped *[TASS]* 1
NATO Rapid Reaction Force Concept Criticized *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Churkin Briefs Press on Foreign Policy Events 2
Bessmertnykh to Italy, Portugal *[TASS]* 2
Denies Embassy in Ethiopia Looted *[Moscow Radio]* 2
On Gorbachev Visit to Oslo *[TASS]* 2
IZVESTIYA Continues KAL Downing Probe 3
Seventh Installment *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 3
Eighth Installment *[IZVESTIYA 24 May]* 6
Analyst on Prospects for G-7 Invitation *[IZVESTIYA 29 May]* 8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Primakov, Shcherbakov on Talks With Baker *[TASS]* 11
Paper Assesses Gates' Appointment *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 May]* 11
Commentary on Soviet-American Summit *[Moscow International]* 12
U.S. Firm, MOSCOW NEWS Eye Joint Project *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 13
Business Official Urges Widening of U.S. Trade *[INTERFAX]* 14
Gorbachev, Bush View Upcoming Summit Topics *[INTERFAX]* 14
Bush Mideast Arms Control Initiative Cited *[TASS]* 15
Profile of Vice President Dan Quayle *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 22 May]* 15

China

Dzasokhov Interviewed on Jiang Zemin's Visit *[Moscow International]* 16
Analysis of Chinese-American Relations *[PRAVDA 28 May]* 17

Northeast Asia

Japan Views Gorbachev Invitation by G-7 *[TASS]* 18
Japan Position on Visits to Northern Territories *[TASS]* 18
Commentator Views DPRK's UN Decision *[Moscow International]* 19
Conference on Problems in Northeastern Asia Ends *[TASS]* 19
Air Traffic Agreement Signed With ROK *[TASS]* 19
Taiwan Holds Economic Seminar in Moscow *[INTERFAX]* 20

Near East & South Asia

No Date Yet for Next 'High-Level' Israel Talks *[IZVESTIYA 29 May]* 20
Radio Rossii Questions Death of Soldier in Gulf *[Moscow Radio]* 20
Consultations in Moscow on Afghanistan 21
Talks with Pakistan *[INTERFAX]* 21
Further on Discussions With Pakistan *[TASS]* 21
Azerbaijan-Israel Communique Signed in Baku *[TASS]* 22
Soviet Mideast Diplomacy Efforts Examined *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 22 May]* 22

Commentary Denies Deteriorating Ties With India *[Moscow International]* 23
Yanayev Receives Afghan Ambassador for Talks *[TASS]* 23

Sub-Saharan Africa

Angola Signs Fishing Cooperation Protocol *[TASS]* 23
Foreign Ministry Marks Africa Day *[TASS]* 24
Commentary on South Africa's Peace Conference *[Moscow International]* 24

East Europe

Minister Gubenko Assails Polish Attitudes *[Warsaw PAP]* 25
Bessmertnykh Receives Bulgarian Aambassador *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 25

West Europe

Preview of Bessmertnykh Visit to Italy, Portugal *[Moscow Radio]* 25
ADN—Germany Plays 'Key Role' in Development *[Berlin ADN]* 26
Soviet-EC Commission Talks in Brussels *[TASS]* 26
Andreotti Cited on Moscow Visit Results *[TASS]* 26
Forces Seek To Leave Germany 'With Dignity' *[PRAVDA 24 May]* 27
Soares Says Portugal Ready To Support Reforms *[IZVESTIYA 24 May]* 28
Gorbachev Greets European Science Forum *[PRAVDA 28 May]* 28
Review of 'Second Russian Revolution' Series *[IZVESTIYA 25 May]* 28
Further Reportage on Thatcher Visit *[TASS]* 29
Ambassador to EC Presents Credentials *[TASS]* 30
Dzasokhov, Legislators Arrive in Sweden *[TASS]* 30
Russian Parliamentarian Holds Talks in Paris *[TASS]* 30

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

USSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 28 May *[Moscow TV]* 32
USSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 29 May *[Moscow TV]* 32
Supreme Soviet Debates Draft Investment Law *[Moscow Radio]* 33
Draft Investment Law Endorsed *[TASS]* 33

Political & Social

'Terrible Plot' Against Central Press Charged *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 33
Cultural Figures Call Off Central TV Boycott *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 May]* 34
PRAVDA Welcomes Court Ruling on Media *[24 May]* 34
First Issue of New KGB Monthly Published *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 22 May]* 35
First Issue of Entrepreneurs' Newspaper Published
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 May] 35
Magazine To Be Available Abroad On-Line *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No 17]* 36
Editors Warn Against New Party Witch-Hunts *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 36
Journal Views Soviet Defector Problem *[Moscow Radio]* 36
Western 'Outdated Stereotypes' Rejected *[TASS]* 36
CPSU Officials Against 'Roundtable' Process *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 37
Secretariat Views Economic Crime Rise *[PRAVDA 28 May]* 40
Humanitarian Aid Distribution Viewed *[TASS]* 42
TASS Reviews Press for 30 May 43

Economic

Foreign Investment Bill Passes 1st Reading *[INTERFAX]* 43
Benefits To Be Increased From Higher Revenue *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 44
'Still Nothing To Buy' Despite 2 Apr Price Hike *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 44
'Useless' Government Economic Program Criticized *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI 28 Apr]* ... 45
Innovative Enterprises Association Established *[Moscow Radio]* 46

Agriculture

Senko on Cabinet's Agro-Industrial Policy *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 May]* 46
Mid-May Weather, Crop Status Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 25 May]* 47

Scientific

MVD Denies 'Harmful Substances' Discharged *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 47
Voronezh Nuclear Power Station Declared Safe *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 47
Launch of 'Progress M-8' Cargo Ship *[TASS]* 48
Soyuz TM-12 Spaceship Undocks From Mir Complex *[TASS]* 48
Docking Earns Soyuz Commander 'Highest Praise' *[Moscow TV]* 48
Functions of Almaz Space Complex Described *[Moscow TV]* 49

Military

CPSU's Surkov Visits Leningrad Troops *[PRAVDA 24 May]* 49
Conversion of Military Production Described *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Over 400 Arms Plants Involved in Conversion *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Internationalist Soldiers Forum Issues Appeal *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 May]* 50
Internationalist Forum News Conference Held *[PRAVDA 24 May]* 51
'Internationalist Servicemen' Movement Explained *[Moscow Radio]* 51
Smirnov Views Role of 'Soldier-Internationalist' *[TASS]* 52

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Thatcher, Baltic Legislators Discuss Developments *[Riga Radio]* 53
Baltic Leaders To Discuss OMON Actions 30 May *[BALTFAX]* 53
Latvian Council Wants Removal of Special Militia *[Riga Radio]* 53
Latvia Fears Renewed Attacks on Customs Posts *[BALTFAX]* 54
Latvian, Soviet Leaders To Meet in Moscow 30 May *[BALTFAX]* 54
Lithuanian Border Post Attacked; Details Reported *[Radio Vilnius]* 54
'Armed Resistance' Possible *[Moscow TV]* 54
Landsbergis Cited on Baltic Council Meeting *[TASS]* 55
'Rebellious' Republics Said To Face Sanctions *[Radio Vilnius]* 55
Armed Forces Demand Enlistment of Lithuanians *[Radio Vilnius]* 55

RSFSR

Nuclear Power Ministry Denies 'Explosions' *[Moscow Radio]* 56
Ministry Responds to Rumors *[Radio Rossii]* 56
Moscow Authorities Investigate *[Moscow Radio]* 57
Yeltsin's 28 May Activities in Severomorsk Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 May]* 57
'Not Friends' With Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 29 May]* 57
Yeltsin's Northern Tour Continues 29 May 58
Visits Petrozavodsk, Karelia *[INTERFAX]* 58
Approves Wider Autonomy for Karelia *[INTERFAX]* 58
Meets With Workers *[Moscow TV]* 59
Economic Document With Karelia Signed *[TASS]* 59
Yeltsin Officially Begins Election Campaign *[INTERFAX]* 59
Campaign Director Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 60

Yeltsin Discusses Communism, Democracy *[Moscow TV]* 60
Candidates Bakatin, Ryzhkov Continue Campaign *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 May]* 62
Ryzhkov Takes Campaign to Krasnoyarsk Plant *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 May]* 62
Deputy Groups Back Ryzhkov *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 25 May]* 62
Thatcher Begins Leningrad Visit 29 May *[TASS]* 63
Cites Admiration for City *[TASS]* 64
Khasbulatov Discusses RSFSR Congress Work *[Moscow TV]* 64
Silayev Answers Deputies Questions 24 May *[Moscow TV]* 65
Status of CPSU Property Referendum Noted *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 20]* 66

Western Republics

Ukraine's Kravchuk on Union Treaty Signing *[INTERFAX]* 67
Ukrainian President Interviewed on 'Sovereignty' *[Paris LE MONDE 29 May]* 67

Caucasus

Gamsakhurdia on USSR Internal Troops Excesses *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 17 May]* 69
Yazov Rules Out International Forces in NKAO *[Moscow TV]* 69
Armenian Party Leaders Favor Union Treaty *[TASS]* 69
Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan's Independence Day Speech *[Yerevan Radio]* 70
Armenian MVD Warns of Effort To Incite Clashes *[Yerevan Radio]* 70
Mutalibov's Azerbaijani 'Revival' Day Statement *[Moscow Radio]* 70

Central Asia

Gorbachev's First Day in Kazakhstan Reported *[PRAVDA 29 May]* 71
Visit Fulfills 'Long-Standing' Promise *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 May]* 71
Farmers Discuss New Methods *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 72
Gorbachev Travels to Chimkent 29 May 73
Meets Farmers *[Moscow TV]* 73
Farming Methods Detailed *[TASS]* 74
Hears Farmers Concerns *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 74
Gorbachev Arrives in Alma-Ata; Agenda Cited *[TASS]* 75
Explains Resignation Talk *[TASS]* 75
Speaks of Entering 'New Life' *[TASS]* 76
Semipalatinsk Range To Be Reprofiled *[TASS]* 76

Last SS-20 Launching Pad Scrapped

LD2805191591 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT 28 May 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Viktor Mazany]

[Text] Kiev May 28 TASS—The last RSD-10 launching pad has been scrapped in the city of Sarny in the western Ukrainian Rovno region. According to the Soviet-American Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter range missiles, Soviet troops dismantled launching pads and means of transportation of Soviet missiles called SS-20 in the West. A total of 509 installations have been scrapped under the watchful eyes of U.S. inspectors.

The last operation was watched with great interest by American and Soviet servicemen and members of the public who converged on Sarny to see Soviet soldiers detach parts from the last launching installation and despatch them for further dismantling, and then use a plasmatron, developed at the Paton electrical welding institute in the Ukraine, to cut off within minutes that part of the six-axial truck which carried the device for putting missiles in a starting position. The truck was thus turned in a common tractor, capable of supporting a heavy crane. Small-size diesel electricity generators removed from the launching installation will also be used for peaceful purposes in the economy.

"We have no regrets in scrapping the installation," Colonel Yevgeniy Kozlov, who supervised the operation, told TASS. "We understand that what we are doing brings relief to the whole world. What we are doing is also setting a pattern for further actions in the disarmament field."

This view is shared by U.S. Major-General Robert Parker, who heads the U.S. local [as received] inspection agency. Parker pointed out that the act could be regarded as a historic event in the movement of both nations towards the elimination of the threat of war. He said he was proud to see that the elimination process was proceeding in strict accordance with the INF treaty provisions. He called it the two countries' joint victory. He said the two countries showed most vividly that agreements of this kind were plausible and effective. They are a tool with which to strengthen confidence in a peaceful future.

NATO Rapid Reaction Force Concept Criticized

LD2905144191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1330 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 29 May (TASS)—NATO defense ministers taking part in a joint sitting of the Military Planning Committee and the Nuclear Planning Group in Brussels yesterday adopted a decision on structural changes in the alliance's military forces which Western observers consider to be the most important reform in the military sphere in all the time the North Atlantic bloc has been in existence.

The leaders of the military departments of the NATO member countries approved recommendations on halving, over the course of the next four or five years, the total number of the alliance's military forces, and also on setting up mobile rapid reaction forces numbering up to 70,000 servicemen, which will fulfill the role of a "fire brigade" in the event of the outbreak of "unexpected regional events." When necessary they will be able to be transferred to various "hotspots" not only in Western, but also in Eastern Europe.

According to British officials cited by the London TIMES, the new NATO strategy will be targeted toward creating a "military counterbalance" to the biggest European power, namely the Soviet Union. Wim van Eekelen, secretary general of the Western European Union, explained that the new NATO "rapid reaction" forces could be used in a crisis situation on the Soviet Union's border with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, or Romania. Lists of "risk factors" have appeared in the U.S. press which, it can be understood, will justify the use of the NATO rapid reaction forces in Central and Eastern Europe. These factors include the possibility of revolt, economic chaos, and the threat of seizure of nuclear and chemical weapons by rebels.

Thus, the decision to create NATO rapid reaction forces has been taken. While U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney adraits that the threat of a USSR attack on Western countries is virtually nonexistent, NATO is planning to increase the potential of the sudden use of force, including in Eastern Europe. Many questions about the functions of the new NATO forces, however, and about the legal mechanism for bring them into action, remain unanswered. Does NATO really lay claim to the right to move rapid reaction divisions to the borders of the USSR, as the secretary general of the Western European Union asserts? With what purpose and against whom?

There are no grounds for optimistic conclusions that the task of the NATO forces will consist only in settling crises until they grow into armed conflicts. On the other hand, it is quite evident that the NATO rapid reaction forces will be able to fulfill the tasks of a first echelon in any sudden attack.

In the nuclear missile age, the very fact of one of the sides' having powerful mobile forces can sharply destabilize the situation in Europe, bring about a chain of "action-counteraction" in the military sphere, and undermine the process of arms control.

Churkin Briefs Press on Foreign Policy Events

Bessmertnykh to Italy, Portugal

LD2905145491 Moscow TASS in English 1442 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Konstantin Voytsekhovskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh will visit Italy and Portugal in the course of a tour beginning on May 30, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin said at a briefing today.

Bessmertnykh is to pay a four hour working visit to Rome on May 30 for talks with his Italian counterpart Gianni de Michelis. The meeting is bound to further the Soviet-Italian Moscow May 22 summit negotiations, the spokesman said.

The sides will exchange opinions on the development of bilateral contacts, "specify the viewpoints with Italian partners on the threshold of a series of major international events, above all the Berlin meeting of the Council of the CSCE foreign ministers."

On the same day Bessmertnykh will go to Lisbon to stay till June 1. He is expected to meet Portugal's President Mario Soares, Prime Minister Anibal Cavaco Silva, and have talks with his Portuguese counterpart Joao de Deus Pinheiro.

Bessmertnykh's meeting with Portuguese leaders, Churkin said, will pursue the political dialogue between the Soviet Union and Portugal. In Moscow, he stressed, "this dialogue is highly assessed, which lends an atmosphere of good-will to the relations between our countries."

"In a number of areas Soviet-Portuguese relations are advancing slowly as of yet," he said. The Soviet side expects Bessmertnykh to have a thorough talk with Portuguese leaders on ways of stepping up bilateral cooperation.

In Portugal's capital, the Soviet foreign minister will also meet U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar, and on May 31 he will attend a ceremony of signing agreements on peace in Angola.

Bessmertnykh will have a talk with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on the morning of June 1.

Denies Embassy in Ethiopia Looted

LD2905145791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1430 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] At the Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow today a briefing on current issues of international policy was held. Speaking to journalists, Vitaliy Churkin, head of the Foreign Ministry Information Department, dwelled in particular in the situation in Ethiopia:

[Begin Churkin recording] The leadership of the USSR Foreign Ministry continues to follow the situation in Ethiopia attentively from the point of view of the safety of Soviet citizens there. Our embassy in Ethiopia is keeping in contact with those in control of the situation in Addis Ababa, in order to resolve technical matters which need to be settled in order to carry out the evacuation of 340 Soviet citizens who are expecting to depart. We hope that this will be possible in the near future. All Soviet citizens in Addis Ababa are located, as before, on the embassy grounds, which are protected. The exception is doctors who are working in the Soviet hospital under the aegis of the Red Cross. They are continuing to do their duty, giving help to the wounded. The situation in the Soviet Embassy and around it is, on the whole, calm. The information broadcast by Central Television, that the Soviet Embassy in Addis Ababa had been looted, is unfounded and untrue. [end recording]

On Gorbachev Visit to Oslo

LD2905182491 Moscow TASS in English 1753 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Excerpt] Moscow May 29 TASS—[passage omitted] [Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy] Churkin said an article in today's SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper, headlined "Demarche on the Eve of the Visit," described Soviet-Norwegian relations "in the wrong light" on the eve of President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Oslo. He said arms reductions were discussed by Soviet and Norwegian sides during preparations for the visit.

Both sides were satisfied with the discussion, Churkin said. "We hope that all issues connected with a dialogue on conventional arms, will soon be removed. This means that nobody will have reasons to worry. That is why the heading of the article is inappropriate, as there has been no demarche on the part of Norway," Churkin said.

Churkin said he hoped for a peace transition of power in Surinam to legally elected representatives of the people, after the May 25 parliamentary election there, "without any pressure on the part of the army leadership or from the outside".

As a result of elections, the provisional government brought to power by the army as a result of a coup d'etat at the end of 1990, has fulfilled its promise to restore democratic forms of power in the country.

"We wish a new government (it should be formed soon) success in overcoming the protracted economic crisis and establishing peace in the country," Churkin said.

Churkin said North Korea's decision to join the United Nations is a "manifestation of common sense and goodwill." He expressed hopes that the step will promote the inter-Korean dialogue, create an atmosphere of peace

and mutual understanding between North and South Korea and reduce tension on the Korean peninsula.

Full and equal participation of the two Korean states in the United Nations should be used for searching ways to reunite Korea, Churkin said. He said Moscow shared the hope expressed in the North Korean Foreign Ministry's statement that in the future, Korea will occupy one place in the United Nations.

He said Moscow proceeded from the assumption that the participation of North and South Korea in the United Nations will enrich the activities of the international organisation and make it really universal.

IZVESTIYA Continues KAL Downing Probe

Seventh Installment

91UF0779A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 May 91 Union Edition p 6

["IZVESTIYA Investigation. Part Two" by Andrey Illesh: "Mystery of the Korean Boeing-747"; seventh article in current series]

[Text]

VII.

Thursday. A telephone call to the editorial offices: "I am calling about the Boeing, but first I want to know whether your phone is tapped. Yes? Then I will call you tomorrow from another phone. I will not say anything right now."

Friday. A new call. "I am calling from a pay phone. My name is Yevgeniy. Does the name 'Central Science and Research Base of the Air Force' mean anything to you? No? Then write this down. (He dictates the address). To my knowledge, at the time there was a lot of talk among officers and soldiers there about the 'black box.' In September-October 1983 there was supersecret work conducted at that base. Several additional posts were set up inside the military unit; they checked ID's and in some places would not even let through people with a substantial number of stars on their shoulder boards, although literally a month before the same people could move freely around the base. Write down the phone number of the duty officer of this unit... And write this down: There is an organization in the Air Force under the code name... (Dictates.) This is where many secrets related to the Boeing are kept. Their switchboard number is... (Dictates). In my opinion, to meet with them would be a serious and dangerous undertaking..."

Yes, as soon as we touched on the subject of the "black boxes," a detective story would begin! We had to take roundabout routes in trying to find out even the simplest things—how many of those "boxes," their size and color. Why, really, make a secret out of such simple things? Simply because secrecy was (and still is!) one of the most solid foundations of our system, a mentality that is still current to this day. But most important: Among the attributes of power, access to information is one of the most important. Although the monopoly on information has been severely undermined in recent years, by digging into a seven-year-old story we to a certain degree encroached on some still solid foundations. After all, behind the secret of the "black boxes" are the career secrets of still acting marshals, generals, and politicians. Some may argue with me (and they do) that in this case we are talking about a military secret. There is no question that each state and each army has a right to have such secrets, to which journalists will not be permitted to have access any time soon. The question is different: By what right is a secret that has taken the lives of absolutely innocent and strictly civilian people considered a military secret?

...A dialogue with a very high-ranking Army official who was anonymously "watching over" our work:

"As I understand it, the investigation has come to a dead end: The military has found the 'black box.' But what is in it? Where is it?"

"Yes, officials are not very generous with information. For instance, USSR Marshal Ogarkov maintains: There was no 'black box' altogether... How are we supposed to interpret this?"

"Very simply! The point is that everything has been done to limit access to information. I doubt, of course, that Nikolay Vasilyevich did not know of the existence of the 'black box' or that it had not been reported to him. There was something else, however—fear of a leak of information! As soon as the 'boxes' were found, a list of all the people related to this discovery was put together. A 'young man' was assigned to each of them. He never left his ward and controlled all his contacts. The circle of such people was very small. Therefore, Ogarkov says that he does not know anything about the 'black box' and believes that by doing so he is protecting a state secret."

"By why is the 'black box' so secret? It would seem that it could be used for the benefit of our country, after the text of the crew's radio conversations is deciphered. Once it is published, everything will fall into place! No other argumentation will be needed. So why are we so jealously protecting this secret?"

"I can only guess. I think you should direct this question to the KGB."

"We have—to no avail. The chief of military counterintelligence, too, said that he did not know anything about the 'boxes.'"

At this point my interlocutor laughed.

"Well, why are you surprised? Such is his job. Besides, how can he accept the idea that such an investigation is being conducted by a journalist, who, on top of everything, has not asked anybody's permission! We have not matured enough for this..."

Yes, we have been collecting information about the "black box" literally grain by grain. Here is a fragment of a conversation with a commander of a border guard naval unit, Captain First Rank Petrov.

"The border guard naval units were not told anything about the size or color of the 'black boxes.' We only knew that there were two of them. We, the border guards, do not have reliable means of searching the ocean floor. I think it was the divers from the Mirchinka that raised the 'black boxes.' Nobody told me and my subordinates officially—here, we finally found them! But the fact of the discovery itself became known very quickly. This happened, if memory serves, closer to the end of October 1983."

"For some reason, the divers did not want to tell us that it was they who had raised the 'black boxes'..."

"It is clear why: They are afraid to take a risk. Let us consider that I have not told it to you, either."

"We have a lot of other testimonies..."

"You do not have to convince me. I know for a fact that they were raised because we ourselves packed them in sea water for transportation to Moscow... Let me explain: They had to be transported in the same environment in which they had been found. I tried to find out some time later the results of the analysis of these boxes—from a lieutenant general. But he was as silent as a fish in a pie. All that is known is that these boxes have everything one can ask for: The parameters of the Boeing equipment's operation are recorded there, and allegedly even the last conversations of the crew captain. But what kind and about what?..."

Among many rumors about the subsequent fate of the "black boxes" that we came across in the course of our investigation, I have encountered this one: They could not be deciphered in our country and had to be sent to the West, where for a substantial fee their contents were deciphered and the boxes themselves returned to the USSR. An employee of the Main Intelligence Directorate (GRU) refuted such suppositions:

"This is pure fantasy! And here is why: It would not be terribly difficult for us to decipher the Boeing's 'black box' here in the USSR. Technically, it is not all that difficult a task. As for military intelligence, we were not involved with the 'black box' directly. Moscow took charge of everything. The upper echelon was happy with the results of the search. But the military top brass did not look all that good in that situation. If we follow through this entire story as to who made the decision to shoot down the aircraft and how, it will become clear that this story is even worse than the one with Matthias Rust. That is the only reason why Akhromeyev, or Ogarkov, or Tretyak—all of whom are still holding high-level positions—do not want to talk to you. That way you will keep stumbling over blank spots in this greatly entangled story."

I think this intelligence officer is right on the main point—there is not much hope for reporters to look into the "black box" in the near future. Still, it is precisely this situation that has emerged around these notorious "black boxes" that allows us to understand much about what was happening in the fall of 1983. Not only in the sky and in the sea, but also in the offices of high-ranking officials, and in the minds and souls of the people.

First of all fear (and what else can secrecy be nurtured on for so many years?): People were so terrorized by these "black boxes" that even now, years later, they are afraid to reach into their memory on this topic. And if they do tell you something, it is on the inevitable condition—"do not refer to me as a source!"

The most important factor in the story with "black boxes," it seems, is that it has exposed the matreshka effect: The secret is hidden in an even more unapproachable and powerful "black box"—our Army system, which, in turn, is hidden in an even more voluminous state system where the most important role is played by fear. This system is capable of turning even a man into a "black box," by making him a tool of spreading lies beneficial to it, the system. Here is just one (out of multitudes, related not only to the Boeing) testimony:

"Dear Colleague! During those events I was KRASNAYA ZVEZDA bureau chief in the Far East. From the very first call to the editorial offices, just a few hours after the event, I was told not to send anything to Moscow through open channels, just accumulate the materials. But what was "accumulating" was just the well-known scheme of the operational environment of that night. The important point is that it was impossible to meet with the pilot who had shot down the aircraft that night. Everybody, including the district commander, Army General I. Tretyak, kept stating: This is out of the question! Only on the evening of 4 September 1983 did I receive a call from Captain First Rank V. Firsov, chief of the newspaper's correspondent network, who said: The matter is taking a political turn; therefore, I had to contact the chief of staff of the Far Eastern Military District urgently and act strictly in accordance with the coded cable that had just been sent to him. It followed from this document that the chief of the General Staff gave permission to a KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent to meet with the pilot and the targeting navigator, who had jointly accomplished this task, to quickly put together for the newspaper their material on how all of this had taken place.

"...About noon on 5 September a UAZ [Urals Auto Works] vehicle approached the An-26 military transport that had been standing there ready; four (or five) officers in Air Force uniforms descended from the vehicle and moved in the direction of the airplane. One of the lieutenant colonels looked as if he did not feel well—or, perhaps, as if he had just received, as it happens, a merciless lashing from a higher-up. He was looking around him in an unnatural manner, as if trying to decide whether he should step on the aircraft ladder or

not. The same distracted look was also in the lieutenant colonel's eyes, which seemed to me to be greenish-gray. The officer's hand, extended to me after a rather sluggish military salute, was cold and totally lifeless.

"This was the Su-15 pilot who had shot down the Boeing—Lieutenant Colonel Gennadiy Nikolayevich Osipovich.

"We spent about two hours of our flight from Khabarovsk to Sakhalin 'squeezing' the events of that 1 September night into a scheme. Precisely this, since each of us held in front of him a just-published TASS statement, in which somebody very knowledgeable recited even the smallest details of what happened. Although it was not possible to get around the real events both in the sky and on the ground, I think you understand that our task—a journalist of those times and a pilot clearly knocked out of psychological balance—was "to tie it all together"! Even the notes I was making in the course of our conversation, and which I still have, do not have as much as a shadow of deviation from the official document of the official information organ.

"However, if you face the necessity of going deeper into this worthy investigation, be careful. This is what you should be aware of. Now, judging by all indicators, Gennadiy Nikolayevich maintains that his driving motivation from beginning to end was a heroic sense of duty. I can testify that this is not exactly true.

"There, in the predawn sky filled with thick moon haze, when he was most of all afraid of the slightest distraction from the instrumentation, of sliding into a hallucination and losing sense of the spatial position of his plane, that was true. But at least on 5 September, when we were reconstructing the chronology of events together, he felt what any normal human being would naturally feel, having—willingly or unwillingly—committed murder. Now and then abruptly distracted from our, to put it mildly, cynical business, he would look for a long time into a bright blister, his pupils not even contracting, and ask, perhaps me, perhaps himself: 'But maybe there was nobody there?'—'Who can tell me precisely how many seats are on this Boeing?'—'Looks like it would have been better if it were one of our "long-rangers"? What is the crew on the Tu-16?'

"When one of the accompanying officers came over with some idle question, Osipovich complained: 'Why are they treating me as if I am insane? For so many days, if you forgive me, I have not even been able to go to the toilet alone; they keep me locked up...' And then: 'Believe me, I did not even imagine that this was a passenger craft. We see these RS-135's everywhere!'

"It is probably easier for you, my colleague, but I still have this pain, both for the victims of that night and for its tragic hero. I think this should also have its place in your investigation: He, the pilot, is also a victim of those mad circumstances.

"Now about a few details. One can hardly seriously talk about the possibility of landing that Boeing-747 on the nearest air field. To my knowledge, at that time there was no suitable runway that could accept such an airliner at least all the way up to Lake Baykal. And the pilot made his several dozen barrel shots, as he told me, not for the purpose of warning but for a kill. Except that he missed.

"The ground recording could, in fact, be lost, since the conversation between, let us say, the targeting navigator and the pilots may be conducted on spread (different) frequencies; one recording device will not record both. The call sign 'Deputat' that remained unclear to you belongs to the targeting navigator on the ground who was directing the intercept. That night it was Senior Lieutenant Vladimir Borisov. Having received an instruction in advance from the unit's deputy chief of staff for combat operations, Major Aleksandr Dovnarovich: "This is a combat target, to be destroyed upon violation of the state border," he was the one who gave Osipovich the command. It is interesting that a day or two later Borisov, in broad daylight, targeted a fighter plane, which was on standing patrol over the area where the Boeing had fallen, toward an assumed Orion and also decisively gave the command "Destroy!" The pilot of the interceptor, however, visually recognized our border troops' Il-14 and aborted the attack...

"And last. You are reproaching somebody for providing Osipovich with a 'scenario' which he later followed in his conversations with journalists. I do not want to take this burden on my soul, but I am afraid that I myself unwittingly did that. I sent the materials from the pilot and the targeting navigator from Sokol to Moscow on the night of 6 September; in the morning, the control tapes were not on the teletype. Perhaps they became this 'scenario'? Here is why I think so. I think that on the same day a plane with the Central Television crew flew from Kamchatka to Sokol. On that plane was one of our special correspondents, a colonel. In a conversation with him, Osipovich was telling him about his planned speech at a peace lesson in a local school. I have obtained this fact from a different source, however, and put it in the text without telling the pilot... [signed] A. Zakharenko, colonel (reserve)."

This is how our domestic information "black box" was built.

Coming back to the real ones that were on the downed plane, one may arrive at one more conclusion: Attempts (unsuccessful!) to break into the "black boxes" brought out this fact: This secret is guarded by American barriers just as securely as it is by Soviet ones. This confirms, albeit indirectly, the hypothesis that this secret is equally "dear" to both our and American special services. But further on this later in the series. (To Be Continued)

Eighth Installment

91UF0787A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 May 91 Union Edition p 8

["IZVESTIYA Investigation. Part Two" by Andrey Illesh: "Mystery of the Korean Boeing-747"; eighth article in current series]

[Text]

VIII.

Not too much time has passed since the day I met this man, but I would not undertake to describe his appearance—to a great extent his manners and behavior lack even a little something that would stick in the memory. Being unnoticeable is probably one of the qualities a rank-and-file participant in the process of manufacturing secrets must possess. Behind Vladimir Ivanovich are many years of work in the Main Intelligence Directorate [GRU] of the General Staff, and foreign assignments. He now works for one of the research institutes.

[GRU officer]...In 1983, just at the time of the events related to the destruction of the Korean passenger aircraft over Sakhalin, I was working in the duty office of the Main Intelligence Directorate of the General Staff. Our service prepared a daily special summary of the military-political situation in the world, which was sent to the highest military and political leaders, first to the general secretary and Politburo members. In addition, similar cables went to the minister of defense, all his deputies, commanders of each section of the Armed Forces, and a number of officials of similar rank.

My duties (as an analyst) included reading all the documents of the past 24 hours. Our work after the KAL-007 destruction also included all the subsequent upheaval around this international scandal. Every day a map was put together, which showed the location of Soviet military ships and American ships, and a description of their actions and how they get in each other's way. The summaries also included the disinformation we were supplying to the Americans. And, of course, their activities that were making the work of our divers and submersibles more difficult.

[Illesh] Where would all these documents be kept today?

[GRU officer] The summaries absolutely must be in the GRU archives.

[Illesh] How frequent and detailed was the intelligence supplied to the CPSU Central Committee?

[GRU officer] For this level, summaries on the Boeing were not on a daily basis. Information was sent there only if it was very important, or if it changed something in the array of forces.

[Illesh] Does the duty service have to register all instances of violation of USSR airspace and reflect them in its documents?

[GRU officer] Unquestionably so. The mechanism in the KAL-007 story was like this: Over a special telephone, the duty service of the Pacific Fleet reported an extraordinary incident from the Far East. I do not remember exactly now what precisely was the first message—whether it was that the aircraft only violated our airspace, or that it had already been shot down by our interceptor. But, judging by the subsequent development of the events in general, such messages were relayed to us with considerable delay. Therefore, I think that the GRU duty service received this information after the fact.

[Illesh] Let us try to follow the chain of radio conversations the night from 31 August to 1 September. Moscow—Khabarovsk—Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. This needs to be done in order to understand the level at which the decision to destroy a passenger aircraft was made. Could this chain look this way: Osipovich is in the air; his commanding officer Kornukov, who later became a lieutenant general, is at the command post of Sokol airfield on Sakhalin; Tretyak, commander of the Far East Military District, is in Khabarovsk; then (arguable links) Marshal Ogarkov; and, at the end of the chain, the minister, Politburo member Ustinov? That is: Could the minister of defense have known about this extraordinary incident while the aircraft was still in the air? Was the decision made at such high level?

[GRU officer] You are asking too much: At my level of responsibilities I cannot know this in sufficient detail. The information that comes to the GRU duty service comes from appropriate staffs or is passed on by the same intelligence organs. In addition, there is a whole network of various independently operating channels for communications and for receiving the information. Therefore (and I am convinced of this) the main information on the Boeing incident had to go through PVO [Air Defense] channels of communications. This goes right away. Almost certainly, it was reported to the GRU duty services after the plane had already been shot down. As for decisionmaking, the intelligence directorate never participates in such matters. The same happened this time as well. The GRU registers the fact, analyzes it, verifies it, and then reports it higher up. The decisionmaking channels, however, are completely different and independent of the GRU. I will tell you on the basis of my own experience, though: In this case, the decision could be made on a level even lower than District Commander Tretyak. This is quite possible.

[Illesh] There is, however, another opinion as well: A military-political decision was made. Why? All this took too much time; Osipovich's attack in the air was called off twice. This means that somebody first decided: Shoot down! Then consulted someone, and canceled the order. Then made another decision, and again canceled...

[GRU officer] I will draw again on my own experience: If we are dealing with the actions of a single intruder aircraft, it is not at all necessary to wake up the Moscow brass at the highest level in the middle of the night. The duty service may not even dare to take such a step: You

may hear in reply such a half-awake bark: "Take your own actions, you have instructions!" that a person in a uniform will not feel happy. Of course, I cannot preclude that the center was contacted—the higher-ups—but, I repeat: Most likely, the decision was made at the level of the district or the Pacific Fleet commander. Hardly higher than that...

[Illesh] How was the sea part of the operation—the work of the divers, the cover supplied by the military, etc.—reflected in the GRU documents?

[GRU officer] At first I was very interested in the progress of the search. Then this interest waned—the hoopla that started around it was too banal. But once in a while I looked into it: What scheme was emerging, and what was being reported up? Then we got a message: The "black box" (or two) has been found! According to our summaries, they were placed in a container of sea water and delivered to Moscow. After that we stopped following this issue altogether. The "boxes," judging by the data that went through the GRU, were delivered to Moscow to some aviation research base. I do not know where exactly.

As for the continuation of this tragedy, it needs additional analysis and thought, a comparison of the facts. Remember: An intensive anti-Soviet campaign was going on for about one and a half or two months, and then faded away. You need to analyze the facts and think of those nuances of political events that could have influenced it.

[Illesh] What do you mean specifically?

[GRU officer] Well, here is, for instance, an interesting fact. On the night the Americans attacked Grenada, our minister of defense received a telephone call (on that "red," "hot" line that was already operational at that time) from the U.S. minister of defense. The latter warned him: The Americans are conducting an action to liberate—let us put it this way—their compatriots in Grenada. Generally speaking, this is the business of intelligence—to uncover such operations in advance. But as of that date the intelligence people had rather ordinary data that would not cause any concern: A carrier task force left bases on the East Coast. It was moving not toward Grenada but to replace another carrier task force that had been on duty in the Mediterranean, in the 6th Fleet. A normal routine rotation, this is what we thought at the GRU. Only later, after the fact, did we find out: This task force had indeed changed its course and moved in radio silence toward the shores of Grenada! As to the course they were supposed to follow, several self-propelled barges and some support ships were sent there, which imitated the movement of a carrier task force with fake radio communications. In such cases intelligence is conducted with the help of satellites and radio intercepts. So: Soviet intelligence had not been able to establish that this was not a carrier task force but some other group. Partly because we were short on resources and manpower... In short, we struck out. While the Americans made a swift landing on Grenada...

[Illesh] Excuse me, Vladimir Ivanovich, but so far I do not see the connection between the operation that destroyed the Boeing over Sakhalin, the anti-Soviet campaign in the U.S. press, and the Marines landing on Grenada...

[GRU officer] Be patient: I did propose that we deliberate a bit. Let me continue. The most interesting part is that Minister of Defense Ustinov called the GRU duty service that same night and ordered the fact that the Americans had taken over Grenada to be included in the military-political summary (the same one that we send to the Politburo). That is, an American military operation was discovered not by intelligence but through a message received from its own superiors—an extraordinary happening! There has been no other case like it in my memory. Further than that, however, I can only offer suppositions. But I cannot preclude the possibility that we uncovered some information on the Boeing, most likely something that showed unsavory actions on the part of the Americans. Having accepted this argument, it becomes possible to advance this hypothesis: Our authorities made some kind of agreement with the American side in regard to the development of events both around Grenada and around the Boeing: We stop the anti-American propaganda in regard to Grenada in exchange for their stopping the anti-Soviet propaganda in regard to the Boeing.

[Illesh] Is such an agreement possible only through Ministry of Foreign Affairs [MFA] channels?

[GRU officer] Not necessarily. There are enough channels. Direct contacts between the military may be plugged in (not necessarily in the United States). It could be in Europe; there are military representatives at the United Nations; and there are, after all, military attaches...

[Illesh] Could such "consensus" be reached outside of the government control?

[GRU officer] By all means. Let me repeat: There are channels to accomplish this. Numerous! Through the KGB, the GRU, the MFA, the Ministry of Foreign Trade—you name it... Or even through private connections.

[Illesh] Our newspaper sent letters to the leadership of the KGB, the Ministry of Defense, and the MFA, asking them to provide us with documents on departmental investigations in the matter of the Korean Boeing. Do you think these organizations should have such documents in their possession?

[GRU officer] I have no doubt that the materials you need are kept in their archives. I know that daily summaries are produced by the Committee [KGB]—just as in the GRU. This is done by their duty service. The

MFA, of course, also has some documents, perhaps from a different angle, in a different volume, but they do exist.

[Illesh] Apparently, when the work was finished, each of these departments put together a report, their conclusions.

[GRU officer] Undoubtedly. Besides, there should be data from the group that had been formed to conduct the work in the Far East—its day-to-day working materials also should have been included in the report. Where are they kept? I think, in the archives of the Ministry of Defense—it is an immutable requirement that this kind of documentation be kept for the future. It is another matter why they are not being made public. What are they afraid of, what are they trying to hide? Why are some documents classified, in general? Quite often it is not because some "competent" departments want to keep their methods of work secret, but because they do not want anybody to know their miscalculations; they do not want to show how weak we are. That is why they try to hide the weakness behind the "Secret" stamp, to hide not what is known but what we ourselves do not know.

[Illesh] So, it looks like it is simply a tradition—not to show anything to journalists?

[GRU Officer] Once the document is stamped "Secret" or "Top Secret," the stumbling block is in the procedures for removing this little stamp... Somebody has to take personal responsibility for removing this classification... But each person has a career... You have to go to the highest level. On the other hand, it is possible that a department is simply afraid to set a precedent: What do you mean—open up the GRU summaries?!

[Illesh] All right, let us leave the GRU summaries; why not declassify the results of the work of the final commission?

[GRU Officer] This, of course, is a completely different matter. It appears that the "black box" was recovered by the Ministry of Defense, but competition in such matters is always very fierce. I remember being part of a similar situation once. At that time, a civilian agency obtained a sample of American military technology; both the Ministry of Defense and the KGB had claims on it. So when the issue of obtaining this sample came up, I, as a representative of the Ministry of Defense, had considerable friction with the KGB, trying to prevent them from grabbing this sample. It could also happen in the Boeing case that the KGB attempted to grab the "black box." But most likely it was the Ministry of Defense that was dealing with the "black box"—it has appropriate institutes and specialists who could open it and study the recordings inside out.[end interview]

...I hope the reader will not begrudge me the fact that I rendered the interview with the former intelligence officer in such detail. I used it without much abridgement, first of all because people of his profession do not often tell newspapers about their work. But have we learned much from the conversation with this source, unusual as he may be?

The version about a collusion of certain forces in the USSR and the United States has already been encountered in some musings of our interlocutors. This intelligence officer also expounded on it, by tying the events around the Boeing with the American fleet's trek to Grenada: The loud anti-Soviet campaign was stopped ostensibly "in return" for silence by our intelligence about the "flap. It would not be serious even to discuss such an assumption. A military adversary's mistake—and this is precisely what the behavior of our intelligence was at that time for the American armed forces—is too valuable to use in trade-offs. As for propaganda campaigns, neither the anti-Soviet nor the anti-American one stopped, generally speaking, until 1986, and even today we sometimes hear reverberations on both sides. It is true that noisy publications on the Boeing did stop abruptly. But what was the reason? Would we not be too naive to take this bait: a mysterious deal between some powerful personalities? Would it not take our conversation away from real down-to-earth problems, from real relations between people and states? Even if we admit the possibility that such an unofficial but high-impact deal was made somewhere by some people, it could not be, in any case, anything but a reflection of the same human oppositions and relations that are far more significant and powerful than any mysterious forces.

For me, in all this conversation, it was something else that was much more interesting and important, even though it may be just a confirmation of certain circumstances of our recent life. First of all it is the fact that the main participants and supervisors of events on such a scale in the country have always been the inhabitants of Staraya Square, where a powerful information machine was in operation. There was also another thought, expressed by this intelligence officer, that helps us, in my view, understand a lot of things: A secret is protected so jealously not when it hides a strength but when it covers a weakness... (To Be Continued)

Analyst on Prospects for G-7 Invitation

PM3005080491 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Stanislav Kondrashov "Political Observer's Opinion": "In Expectation of G-7 Aid"]

[Text] In our busy times not a week passes without an important round of political maneuvering—inside the country, abroad, or in between. This week also sees such a round—in Washington—with the participation of official Moscow representatives. The aim is to obtain greater clarity on the question of inviting the USSR president to the G-7 meeting in London in mid-July. We have already made our position as guest clear: We want to go. And Mikhail Gorbachev made this plain on the record at the recent press conference with Italian Prime Minister

Giulio Andreotti. But the members of G-7 have still not defined their position regarding the invitation. As the host, British Prime Minister John Major should extend the invitation. The key player, however, the one on whom the go-ahead depends, is, of course, George Bush.

Moscow's envoys in the American capital—Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the Security Council; and Vladimir Shcherbakov, first deputy prime minister—are now hoping for a favorable outcome from their meeting with him. So far a polite "no" has been more discernible in Bush's evasive response. Meanwhile two of the seven—Andreotti and Canada's Mulroney—have apparently already said "yes." Kohl, Mitterrand, and Major will not object if the Americans agree. Only the Japanese are resolutely opposed, having failed to obtain concessions on the territorial issue during Gorbachev's visit and therefore sticking to their tough stance of pressuring the USSR. But there is no doubt that Kaifu too will lift his objections in Bush's wake.

So the first thing is to get an invitation. The second and main thing is for participation to be effective. Expectations have been greatly raised by the efforts of the "support group" headed by economist Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, which is in Harvard where—with presidential blessing and even more on its own initiative—it is drafting with American colleagues, at an unofficial level, a program to rescue the Soviet economy with Western help. Judging by the degree of expectation on the Soviet side, mid-July in London could be the high spot of this summer in international terms. The major prize at stake is a new practical breakthrough in the West's relations toward the Soviet Union and the G-7 countries' jointly committing themselves to a strategy of large-scale assistance to Soviet reform at this most critical time for it.

The Soviet Union in return undertakes to guarantee (notably through all-around G-7 participation) to radicalize the transfer to a market economy, providing adequate and rigorous certainty instead of the protracted wallowing in a muddy pool of half-measures. Social accord inside the USSR, primarily on the basis of legislatively enshrined new relations between the center and the republics, is another supreme guarantee in this comprehensive horizontal and vertical package. The second meeting in Novo-Ogarevo seems to have confirmed that the movemement in this direction initiated one month ago by the "Nine plus One" statement is continuing. According to the planned timetable the republic Supreme Soviets should discuss the agreed text of the Union Treaty in another month's time.

A suitable title has already been devised for all this—the Big Deal. We offer them—and ourselves!—a market economy, which will in time bring us the prosperity which is so well known to the inhabitants of the G-7 countries. Plus the irrevocable dismantling of the totalitarian unitary state and further irreversible reduction in the Soviet military machine. They offer us, also thinking on a grand scale, $20 to 30 billion per annum in total aid, with up to $150 billion over five years. The game is worth the candle. Let them not be petty. Let them understand that if the Soviet Union falls apart, and with a crash and a wide dispersal of various kinds of delayed-action mines, it will be worse for them too; it will cost them, too, a lot. America will have to maintain the present level of global military readiness at a cost of around $300 billion per annum, despite long-standing budget deficits and the current economic recession. Let Bush then try to create the "new world order"! That roughly is the logic of our hopes.

But there is a skeptical saying regarding high hopes: "It is too good to be true." It is correct that the West does have a vital interest in our radical reconstruction and our peaceful involvement in the world economy. The G-7 never tires of expressing its political support for Gorbachev, particularly when he makes efforts to reach agreement with Yeltsin and the leaders of the other republics. You hear this from Bush daily despite all his prevarication over the London meeting.

But the stumbling block is nevertheless the other G-7 members. They are more down-to-earth. They do not have—what can you do?!—the kind of free flight of thought and fancy of those of us who have emerged if not from under Gogol's overcoat then from Gogol's pen, as it were. And they know how to count money and do not want it to disappear into a bottomless barrel: After all, it is they, not us, who will then have to answer to their taxpayers. And what is more, Washington is not averse to pressuring Moscow politically for greater guarantees. That is why all the discussion there about the Big Deal is conducted more quietly and modestly, with provisos, and in muted tones.

When that modest millionaire Bush was asked his attitude to the Soviet request for $100 billion in aid (mistakenly ascribed to Gorbachev personally), his response was short but to the point: "One hundred billion—that's a lot of money." Finally, does the hesitation over whether to extend the invitation to London not contain the following cautious consideration: The G-7 countries fear overheightened expectations like the plague because of the possible damage to Gorbachev at home and in the foreign arena if he returns from London empty-handed. And if expectations are exaggerated, even hands holding billions instead of tens of billions will seem empty.

The previous round of our intensive quest for Western aid occurred last summer and fall with Gorbachev's visits to Rome, Paris, Madrid, and, most importantly, to Bonn. The USSR's creditworthiness had already collapsed and the confusion in relations between the center and the republics was raging at full pitch, frightening foreign investors, but European colleagues and friends did disburse to him as the architect of perestroyka a billion here, one and a half to two billion there. The chief financier was and clearly will remain Bonn. There they have promised in all, as the Germans have themselves calculated, $33 billion. Indeed, if you compare Washington's contribution to Bonn's, it provides more of a general blessing than money: One billion in credit at the

start of last winter for Soviet purchases of American agricultural produce. Now another 1.5 billion for these purposes hangs in the air.

And the pattern takes a familiar form: The more hopeless the situation, the greater the expectation of a miracle. The worse things become, the greater the demands. Last December the EC assumed a total aid commitment of roughly $2.5 billion. The events in Vilnius in January froze that project, and it has been revived only now after new spring shoots have appeared in the field of our multinational democracy. But the development of the crisis has made it even less adequate. The Soviet Union now aims higher and appeals not just to the Council of Europe but to the global economic Olympus.

The Washington round this week will scarcely shed complete light on the situation. After all, six weeks of complex diplomatic maneuvering by the sides still remain before the London meeting. We will keep an interested eye on this without, however, experiencing undue expectations or forgetting to count on our own efforts.

United States & Canada

Primakov, Shcherbakov on Talks With Baker

LD3005062591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2249 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin]

[Text] Washington, 30 May (TASS)—Ye.M. Primakov, member of the USSR Security Council and V.I. Shcherbakov, first deputy prime minister of the USSR, who are in Washington on the instructions of the USSR president to make contacts and hold consultations with high-ranking members of the U.S. Administration, met U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on Wednesday. G.A. Yavlinskiy, member of the group of Soviet experts and V.G. Komplektov, USSR ambassador to the United States, took part in the conversation, which lasted almost two hours.

U.S. Secretary of State Baker, responding to reporters' questions after the meeting, characterized it as "very useful and frank."

"The United States," said Baker "of course is very interested in support for the political and economic reforms in the Soviet Union. The first step in the plan of economic reforms for the Soviet Union is a step in the direction of real market reforms, utilizing incentives to open up the huge potential of the USSR, and utilizing its considerable natural resources and professional labor. We spoke about this today. We would like to know some more about the new ideas about which we have just talked during our meeting. President Bush has already said that we are continuing to support President Gorbachev firmly, and to firmly support the process of political and economic reforms in the Soviet Union. We want such reforms to be successful."

Ye.M. Primakov reported that during the meeting the American side was acquainted with the latest variants of the Soviet Government's plan for leaving the crisis situation through the stabilization of the economy under conditions of moving toward the market. A group of Soviet and American experts is working on helping the USSR move toward the market. During the meeting with the U.S. secretary of state, Ye.M. Primakov noted at the news conference, V.I. Shcherbakov gave a detailed explanation of all the questions that interested the U.S. side connected with the economic reform program.

"Our program envisages fairly radical measures for moving toward the market, covering the liberalization of prices, privatization, removing state control, and the openness of the economy for cooperation with other countries," Ye.M. Primakov said. He noted that during the present meetings there was no talk of "any specific figures for financial aid to the USSR proposed by either our side or the American side." "It is a matter of movement together to advance our reforms," Ye.M. Primakov added.

Earlier the same day, the representatives of the Soviet president met Michael Boskin, chairman of the president's economic council, and Robert Dole (Republican, Kansas) leader of the republican minority in the Senate.

Paper Assesses Gates' Appointment

PM2905150791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by L. Alekseyev: "The Return of Gates. Brushstrokes in a Portrait of the Probable U.S. Intelligence Community Chief"]

[Text] President Bush recently announced that R. Gates, deputy assistant to the President for national security affairs and formerly a professional intelligence agent, is to be appointed to the post of director of the CIA. Thus the U.S. intelligence community, which traditionally exerts considerable influence on the formulation of the American administration's positions and the country's policy, above all in relation to the Soviet Union, will probably get a new leader if he is confirmed by Congress.

What is the significance of the return to the CIA of R. Gates, who is currently one of President Bush's closest and most trusted staffers and until recently was one of American intelligence's leading analysts specializing in the Soviet Union?

It is widely known that in recent decades the U.S. CIA's activity was mainly concentrated in the struggle against the Soviet threat all over the world, on which more than half the annual budget of the American intelligence community—the astronomical sum of $30 billion—was spent. With the onset of transformations in our society and the affirmation of glasnost and openness, a sharp increase has been observed in the CIA's Soviet-oriented work, both in terms of agent-derived intelligence methods and in the field of secret operations.

Although an end has been declared to the Cold War in political terms, it is not only in the Soviet Union that people are noticing that equivalent changes in American intelligence's forms and methods of work have unfortunately still not occurred. There are frequent instances of disinformation regarding the aims of Soviet foreign policy and of attempts to mislead our public and political circles about the true aims of the United States in relation to the USSR.

Recently there has been much talk in our press about the unseemly activity of the CIA's offspring, Radio Liberty, and the involvement of the special services in providing assistance for opposition structures in our country through various legal channels. This list could be extended. It is not by chance that in the United States, and primarily in Congress, the conviction is being voiced that it is necessary to change the CIA's role, tasks, and work methods, and bring them into line with the new political realities.

What are they saying about the views and positions of R. Gates in the United States?

As is clear from reports in the American press, during meetings with representatives of the American business world and with journalists, R. Gates noted that the development of events in the USSR had brought home to the U.S. administration the need to refrain from one-sidedly backing the present Kremlin leadership and to make the transition to a "multipolar and multilevel policy" of Soviet-American relations. Moreover, he is considered to be the coauthor of the so-called "parallel contacts" idea which allows for the possibility of the U.S. Administration's maintaining contacts not only with the central leadership but also with the leaders of the union republics. We should give him his due: R. Gates acknowledges that "the realization of ideas such as these will entail the possibility of America being accused of barefaced interference in the internal affairs of the USSR."

R. Gates has always favored the maintenance by the United States of a high level of intelligence activity against the USSR. It is not by chance that one of the former leaders of the CIA, B. Inman, once remarked: "Over the past 25 years a guarantee of rising to the very top of the CIA was to show ability and competence in carrying out operations against the USSR." R. Gates himself acknowledged that "today about a half of all American intelligence resources is being spent (by America) on intelligence work relating to the USSR and China."

The following pronouncement by R. Gates is revealing on the subject of his attitude to the Soviet Union: "The qualitatively new elements of the Soviet Union's intelligence profile as the "main adversary" are political instability caused by deepening interethnic contradictions, the general crisis of the Soviet federative system, and the worsening economic situation. The growing openness of Soviet society offers major opportunities for giving covert or legal support to opposition structures in the USSR."

The adduced list of R. Gates's pronouncements on the Soviet Union and his understanding of the role of American intelligence in its work relating to our country could be extended. However, this is enough to get some idea of the positions espoused by the man who will probably head the U.S. intelligence community and substantially influence the formulation of Washington's positions and approaches to the Soviet Union. To be frank, everything that we know about R. Gates does not leave much room for radiant optimism. We all have a sincere interest in the long-term, constructive, and mutually beneficial development of relations with the United States of America. Can a man who has long espoused what is, to put it mildly, a critical position in relation to the Soviet Union play a part in tackling this task?

It is also legitimate to ask this question: How should we interpret the appointment of R. Gates to the post of CIA director—as a victory for the conservatives in American policy toward the Soviet Union?! If so, it is appropriate to recall R. Gates's noteworthy pronouncement: "The assistance that intelligence gives to political leaders also includes saying things they don't want to hear." If R. Gates does not change attitude to the USSR, it is easy to imagine what he will advise President Bush, who favors the development of mutually beneficial relations with the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, we would like to trust to good sense and wish R. Gates, in a free interpretation of the words of Kurt Vonnegut: "Lord, grant him the spiritual peace to accept what he cannot change; and the courage to change what he must..."

Commentary on Soviet-American Summit

LD2905130291 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 29 May 91

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] Is the Washington administration changing its course aimed at partnership with the Soviet Union, or does it adopt a wait-and-see policy? Does the distrust toward some American policies revive itself in Moscow? Or are these questions simply press speculations? These comments by Yuriy Solton:

I see two tendencies here and in general they coincide. Both in the Soviet Union and in the United States there are those who are worried about the two countries' rapprochement and those who believe that this rapprochement is [words indistinct]. Now, many people ask will the Soviet-American summit really take place and if so, where and when.

Already by the attention paid to the Gorbachev-Bush talks we can judge about the importance of the event. [Words indistinct] themselves. The Soviet Union, no matter what disputable questions may arise, does not deviate from its stand. The Soviet leaders consider partnership with the United States an important element in constructing a new world order.

On Monday, George Bush phoned Mikhail Gorbachev. During their conversation both men voiced confidence that the summit meeting is important and both countries need it. The presidents have agreed to continue to work in the spirit of mutual confidence which is so typical of their relationship. Speaking afterwards before journalists, George Bush said that he wanted to go to Moscow. He stated that he had said this to Mikhail Gorbachev, that there was no estrangement, neither from him nor from the Soviet Union.

It seems that the only obstacle hindering setting the date for the meeting is the differences between the Soviet Union and the United States on interpreting the Treaty on cconventional Armed Forces in Europe. Recently a Soviet delegation led by the chief of staff, Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, visited Washington. The sides have

not managed to solve all the disputable issues, but they have made progress. Both Washington and Moscow believe that they should further work to solve the differences which, according to George Bush, are now very small.

I believe an outcome can be found that will facilitate the completion of the work over another important agreement on disarmament, an agreement on reducing the strategic offensive weapons of the two countries.

The Soviet foreign minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, and the American secretary of state, James Baker, will meet in Lisbon on 31 May at the ceremony of signing the documents on peace in Angola. the two men will use the opportunity to discuss the perspectives for the Soviet-American summit meeting. I think that they could remove the last differences on the disarmament questions and coordinate the question on where and when the Soviet-American summit will take place.

U.S. Firm, MOSCOW NEWS Eye Joint Project

91UF0783A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by M. Berger: "Has the Time Come For Agreements? Entrepreneurs and Journalists Have Decided To Cooperate Directly in a Soviet-American Partnership"]

[Text] The idea seemed quite utopian. One American company and one Moscow newspaper decided to take Soviet-American relations to a qualitatively new level in order to insure an intensive flow of American private investments in the Soviet market. They are even giving examples of the possible flow of capital—up to tens of billions of dollars each year for 10 or 15 years. The authors of this, let us be candid, are counting on success, which up to now it has never been possible to realize.

This very courageous optimism and the high expectations are connected with the fact that the basis for the program "Partnership for Progress" is, according to its creators, a new concept. The sponsors are, on the American side, one of the largest consulting firms, Hill and Knowlton, and on our side, MOSCOW NEWS. Later, the Scientific and Industrial Union, the Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs, and the USSR Union of United Cooperatives, joined the "deal."

So why in this case are they achieving what others have failed to do? Here are the arguments of the those who sponsored the concept.

Up to now, our state structures, operating within the bounds of a regulated regime and with their own system of interests and motives, have never been successful. Reducing the role of the state organs in the organization of a partnership to a minimum and moving the entrepreneurs themselves and their voluntary unions and associations directly into the main roles, the sponsors believe, will give the process new content.

Moreover, it is not a matter of aid, but of mutual aid.

The whole world knows that we need aid, but the fact that it is necessary to help the American economy, and even more that we are involved in it, is, to say the least, strange. However, the senior vice-president of Hill and Knowlton T. Meys is convinced that the circumstances have changed sharply, and following the long upsurge of the eighties, the American economy can expect its worst depression in 30 years. One factor that makes it possible to soften the blow is vigorous activity in the last unexploited and very large market left in the world. And our company, T. Meys says, will be cooperating with our Soviet partners in the program in every possible way.

Will this cooperation turn out to be successful, will the American entrepreneurs resolve their own possible problems with our help, thus helping us at the same time? For many companies have tried to attract American investors but have failed to achieve any notable successes in this business.

"We are different from other consulting companies," says T. Meys, "mainly because they provide an analysis of a situation while we persuade and agree. Moreover, our plan will help make the republics want to remain in the Union rather than leave it. It is an ideal basis for stimulation and development, and if our assessments are right, then the only obstacles on the road to its realization will be the war of laws.

So, perhaps the time has come for agreements? The American partners at least are convincing not only the entrepreneurs but also the politicians and public opinion. And both sides want to guarantee a plan for support from below. In accordance with the concept, our side will, apart from anything else, use all possible means to promote the creation of a favorable investment climate in our country, and, giving due consideration to those involved in the program, this is a quite realistic task. The question of the guarantees that the investment process will require is more complicated. The "Partnership for Progress" plan envisages the creation of a joint-venture bank that would assume some of the guarantees for specific projects. Initially it is planned that the startup capital will be $100 to $150 million, which is not a bad sum for cooperation with small and medium-size businesses.

Whereas one of the main motives for the Americans is the future deterioration of the state of the market, for the participants on our side it is the desire to promote the formation of a numerous "middle stratum," the stratum of entrepreneurs.

Not all the arguments of the sponsors seem convincing and many questions still need clear-cut answers, and it is difficult to rid oneself of the feeling that it is a somewhat romantic idea. The sponsors refer to the positive conclusion reached by the experts (the project was examined by experts both here and across the ocean) and to the cold calculations.

Well, if something does come of it, we will not be the worse for it. On the contrary.

Business Official Urges Widening of U.S. Trade

OW3005091191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] The chairman of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Mr. Vladislav Malkevich, who also co-chairs the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council [ASTEC] told an annual council meeting, the 14th of its kind, opening in New York on May 29, that bilateral trade was insignificant because of America's refusal to grant an MFN [Most Favored Nation] status to the Soviet Union.

As it is now, high import tariffs are levied on Soviet exports to the United States, three to 10 times up on certain commodities compared to other countries. U.S. export controls, including Cocom regulations, remain a huge stumbling block to Soviet imports of advanced Western technologies. The Soviet Union's share of U.S. foreign trade runs at a mere 0.3

to about 2

by the United States.

Soviet exports to the United States can be increased after U.S. Congress ratifies the bilateral trade agreement which it put as a condition linked to the adoption by the Soviet Union of a new emigration law. The law was passed by the central parliament in Moscow in the middle of this month.

The ASTEC meeting which also involves representatives of the non-government sectors of the economy is expected to discuss wider U.S. investments in the Soviet Union, banking and taxation reforms and the prospects of convertibility of the ruble.

This year's membership of the ASTEC is put at 850 (400 U.S. members and 450 Soviet).

Gorbachev, Bush View Upcoming Summit Topics

OW3005060491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 29 May 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" by M. Mayorov, diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Soviet President's aide Vitaly Ignatenko said at a briefing on May 28 that a telephone conversation between Gorbachev and Bush two days ago addressed issues linked up both with arms cuts and with Soviet-U.S. economic cooperation during the forthcoming summit. The Soviet President's press-secretariat DP [Diplomatic Panorama] when asked for comments did not enlarge on what the "economic interaction" meant but said that the formula might be related to the "Washington mission" of the Security Council member Yevgeniy Primakov and economist Grigoriy Yavlisnky's current work at Harvard.

An interest in the prospects of Soviet-U.S. trade and economic cooperation is kept alive both by the Gorbachev-Bush summit next summer and by a possible Soviet participation in the London big 7 conference. Today, may 29, the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council (ASTEC) met for the 14th time on a three-day session.

Chairman of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry and ASTEC co-chairman Vladislav Malkevich reminded in this connection that the USSR remains one of the 12 countries the U.S. continues to withhold the most favoured nation status from. As a result, Soviet exports are subject to U.S. customs dues that are 3 to 10 times as high as those on similar products from other countries. Until last December the U.S. companies trading with the USSR could not use loans and credit guarantees from the U.S. Export-Import Bank that was established in 1934 to credit U.S.-Soviet trade. Finally, the U.S. export control system, including COCOM, is a formidable barrier to the flow of U.S. high technology to the USSR.

It is not surprising that the U.S. accounts for a scant 2 percent of Soviet foreign trade, and the U.S., for around 0.3

of U.S. foreign trade, emphasized Malkevich.

ASTEC co-chairman described the situation as absurd. If the trade, relations agreement signed on June 1, 1990, during Gorbchev's visit to the USA is ratified and the USSR is granted the most favoured nation status, this country will be able to expand its exports to the USA. The situation is not hopeless as Washington has thus far been linking the ratification with the passage by the Soviet Union of an emigration law.

According to Malkevich, he was pleased to see that for the first time ever ASTEC had more Soviet members (450) than it has U.S. ones (400). Beginning last year, ASTEC has invigorated its work in some of Russia's regions, including the Volga region. Siberia, and the Far East. There are plans to open an ASTEC branch on the U.S. Western seaboard, in San Francisco, that will be directly geared to Russia's needs.

DP learned that around 500 Soviet delegates are participating in the current ASTEC meeting, including commercial banks, exchanges, business associations, joint ventures, cooperatives, Union and republican parliamentarians and local leaders.

Bush Mideast Arms Control Initiative Cited

LD3005084191 Moscow TASS in English 0807 GMT 30 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksey Berezhkov and Pavel Vanichkin]

[Text] Washington May 30 TASS—U.S. President George Bush, speaking before graduates of the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs on Wednesday, proposed several major initiatives on arms control in the Middle East.

"We are committed to stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction," Bush said.

"But there is a danger that despite our efforts, by the end of this century nearly two dozen developing nations could have ballistic missiles. Many already have nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons programmes," he said.

"Nowhere are the dangers of weapons proliferation more urgent than in the Middle East," he said.

The essence of Bush's proposals was clarified in a White House press release circulated on Wednesday.

The United States called on Israel and all Arab states to introduce a verifiable ban on the production and purchasing of materials used in nuclear weapons production, sign a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and subject all nuclear facilities in the region to international control.

The United States supports the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the region, the document said.

Middle Eastern countries should be among the first to sign a convention banning chemical arms and comply with the ban even before the convention is signed, Washington believes.

The United States called for stepping up the regime banning biological weapons and urged the countries in the region to pass confidence-building measures on the issue.

It suggested that Middle Eastern countries freeze the purchase, production and testing of land-to-land missiles.

The United States called on Great Britain, China, the Soviet Union and France, who together with the United States are the largest exporters of weapons to the region, to hold high level meetings in the nearest future to discuss measures to curb the delivery of conventional weapons and mass destruction weapons and corresponding technology to the Middle East.

Profile of Vice President Dan Quayle

91UF0772A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 20, 22 May 91 p 4

[Article by political observer Igor Belyayev: "The Quayle Enigma"]

[Text] **There has been an explosion of world interest in the No. 2 in the United States—Vice President Dan Quayle. Particularly in connection with the fact that at the time of G. Bush's recent illness the question of the temporary transfer of presidential authority to the former arose. As did many questions, including: Is he ready to perform the duties of the head of the administration? Even for a short time? After all, Americans know so little about his professional qualities. In fact, what do we know about him? Practically nothing. But it is essential that we do know him, the more so if it is considered that in the very near future Dan Quayle intends to visit the East European countries. We should not forget something else either—second persons in the United States and in other countries have performed and may perform, by virtue of unfolding circumstances, an important role....**

For the past two years and more Dan Quayle has been in G. Bush's heavy shadow. Particularly at the time of the war in the Persian Gulf region. Now, however, the interesting results of a poll conducted by Gallup in March 1990 have been warily recalled. At that time 54 percent of those polled, including 43 percent of Republicans, had more than unflattering things to say about Dan Quayle. They passed the impartial verdict that he was insufficiently qualified to be president of the United States. Some 49 percent believed that G. Bush (not having exhibited signs of illness at that time) should find himself a new partner for the 1992 election....

Dan Quayle himself reacted to the results of the poll quite calmly:

"My qualities have always been based on personal contacts and a desire for compromise...."

The American journalists who observe him constantly believed that such a self-testimonial was only wishful thinking, nothing more. After all, the present vice president has to constantly fight off opponents showering him with their unduly offensive opinions and caustic comments. Yet Dan Quayle is, for all that, vice president of the United States. Formally No. 2 in the present administration.

When he was elected to the Senate in 1980, many people became lost in conjecture: What played the part of springboard in his jump to Capitol Hill in Washington? The most penetrating of his friends were most likely right in believing that it was his family. Dan Quayle prefers not to expatiate on it. Its connections with the ruling establishment are more than considerable....

Dan Quayle was attending a privileged school in the state of Arizona just when his neighbor, the celebrated Barry Goldwater, was starting his unsuccessful bid for

the presidency. All that was happening at that time around the legendary senator and subsequently, when he was head of the Senate Intelligence Committee, became a topic of the most attentive discussion in the Quayle household. The political beliefs of Barry Goldwater, a conservative among conservatives, were professed by all generations in the family of the future vice president. After all, it was with good reason that his appearance on G. Bush's team evoked a sigh of relief from the right....

Dan Quayle is not an extremist, which is to his credit. And no one would venture to accuse the present vice president of unpopular extreme actions. Although, chronologically, at least, he is a contemporary of the "cold war." He was born in 1947. Garry Wills, who wrote about this in TIME magazine, considered it his duty to recall that the CIA emerged simultaneously with him. As also, incidentally, the notorious list of U.S. subversive organizations and the program for consolidating domestic security, which caused a considerable sensation. His father and grandfather did everything for the victory of D. Eisenhower at the 1952 presidential election. But barely had the legendary general taken a step toward cooperation with the Soviet Union before the two supported the John Birch Society, which had appeared in 1958 and was conservative even among conservatives!

It is claimed that Dan Quayle spent his political youth among those for whom devotion to the Birchites was food for the soul. But it was at that time that his propensity for compromise, which has become second nature to him as a politician, made itself known. Over the years it has become predominant, which helped him surprisingly find himself in the White House with President G. Bush in 1989.

In his student years Dan Quayle did not overlook journalism, although his main attachment was, in accordance with family tradition, to politics. Graduating from law school in Indianapolis, he gained a real opportunity to make his way in big politics. Which is why, in fact, he doggedly took in the subtleties of the law. Contiguity with ideology became an imperative for him. His mental attunement against the left took shape firmly, which helped him in his ascent....

Dan Quayle has given a superlative account of himself in political mountaineering. He would first climb to the next peak and quickly master all the necessary methods allowing him to hold on there. He would then begin to prepare for the next ascent. An ability to choose for oneself a suitable job is an art possessed by far from everyone laying claim to an involvement in politics professionally. Or, indeed, one who aspires to become firmly ensconced in the beckoning corridors of power. Dan Quayle did possess it. Not every American politician, even one made wise by experience, possesses so enviable a quality....

[Text] A student at a university in Northern Indiana renowned for its traditions inculcated by the Methodist Church, which is the most influential in the United States, he now devoted his whole time only to politics. His family—the generator of all his ideas—believed that opportunities to get among the "big boys" could in fact be in store for him. It was at that time that there appeared the quality which is helping him now—an endeavor, significant to all those with an interest in him, to be in the right place at the right time and to achieve consensus. By no means at any price, but always preserving an opportunity to appear necessary to a sponsor or partner. The all-absorbing pragmatism most likely ensured his appearance on G. Bush's team at the 1988 elections....

Not the least role in his rapid career has been performed by his ability to find a common language even with fellow travelers. Of course, for the sake of compromise in politics, to which Dan Quayle himself is devoted, he is always prepared to opportunely and appropriately switch on his whole arsenal, as yet not fully revealed, of personal charm. It is considerable. And when his own arsenal manifestly comes up short, he is helped out by his wife Marilyn and his children. It was they who were christened Dan Quayle's "rescuers" when he ran for the Senate in 1980.

When many authoritative political observers of what is happening in Washington, "from within," so to speak, attempt to define Dan Quayle's place under President G. Bush, some of them sometimes agree in the assertion that the present vice president is playing in the White House the same part that R. Nixon played under D. Eisenhower, although there is no comparing their political importance. Nonetheless, there is something to so by no means surprising a comparison. At the same time I would like to emphasize that the times, gentlemen, have changed. There has been an appreciable change in the relations between the United States and Soviet Union. A new world order is gaining momentum....

Some people in the White House consider Dan Quayle the "voice of the right" even. I believe that there are grounds for such a strong opinion, but it fails to take account of the environment in which G. Bush has to operate. Any U.S. president has to pay his dues to the conservatives, if only for effect. Even if he himself is not of the right. And the present vice president is taking account of so important a circumstance not without benefit to himself. Speaking of his attitude toward the Soviet Union, Dan Quayle always emphasizes that his position does not differ from that of the president....

China

Dzasokhov Interviewed on Jiang Zemin's Visit

OW2905022591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 2200 GMT 20 May 91

[Station reporter (Machenko's) interview with Dzasokhov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, on Jiang Zemin's visit to the Soviet Union]

[Text] Commenting on last week's formal visit to the Soviet Union by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, Dzasokhov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet International Relations Department, said: The visit was quite successful.

The following is an interview with him by station reporter (Machenko).

Dzasokhov said: I think the visit has achieved rich, substantial, and beneficial results. From the point of view of politics, state affairs, and even humanity, my comments are also fair. During the distinguished Chinese guest's short visit to our country, he was sincerely welcomed by all the people he contacted.

Dzasokhov pointed out: Jiang Zemin, as a leader of a great country, is a very amiable man. On the international issues discussed during his visit, I would like to emphatically point out the special role of Soviet-Chinese relations in the contemporary world. Our relations are not directed against any third country. Instead, the increase in understanding and trust between our two countries is a guarantee for the stability and security of Asia, and the world as a whole. We should not forget that the Soviet Union and China, as permanent members of the UN Security Council, have special responsibilities for this. In the Soviet-Chinese joint communique issued at the end of Jiang Zemin's visit, both sides expressed the desire to further promote the normalization of the international situation, reduce armaments, and quicken the pace of solving regional conflicts. The Soviet Union and China reiterated that they do not seek world hegemony and oppose any hegemonism in international policies.

Dzasokhov pointed out: This is a basic principle of the two countries' foreign policies.

(Machenko) said: Major progress has been made in promoting the ties between the CPSU and the CPC, and between the legislative assemblies of the two countries. What are your comments on the present situation and future prospects of these ties?

Dzasokhov said: I think the cooperation in these two sectors is developing very smoothly and benefiting both countries. The Soviet Union is glad to note that the periodical contacts between the two parties and between the parliaments of the two countries in the past period of time have provided both sides with a large amount of information, which takes the experience of both sides into consideration and can help both sides surmount unavoidable obstacles on the road of reform. While Jiang Zemin was visiting the Soviet Union, leaders of the Soviet Union and China reiterated their hope to continue developing relations between the two parties and between the legislative assemblies of the two countries. I would like to stress that in the future, relations can be developed under the principle of maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in one's own hands, full equality, mutual respect, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

Dzasokhov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Supreme Soviet International Relations Department, concluded: As for myself, I will do my best to promote the development and consolidation of these relations.

Analysis of Chinese-American Relations

PM2805133191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 91 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "Viewpoint": "Why the Threats?"]

[Text] This month many people in the United States are talking and writing about China. Not in connection with the Sino-Soviet summit meeting in Moscow—the U.S. mass media have deliberately paid little attention to that. It is a question of relations between Washington and Beijing, the deterioration in these relations—perhaps the most serious deterioration since Nixon's sensational visit to Beijing in 1972.

"Washington's 20-year efforts to bring Beijing closer to the Western perception of the world are under threat," the weekly NEWSWEEK states. "The entire system of U.S.-Chinese relations has unexpectedly begun to be reviewed." THE WASHINGTON POST echoes. "A struggle has flared up over whether to extend China's Most Favored Nation status in trade."

The low tariffs on Chinese goods do indeed expire 3 June. After events on Tiananmen Square in 1989, President Bush overcame considerable Congressional opposition in order to retain China's Most Favored Nation status. Everything indicates that it will be even harder to extend the privileged arrangements another year. Legislators are demanding either that it be canceled altogether or that Beijing meet certain conditions. For instance, Senator Mitchell's bill says that it should lift restrictions on foreign travel, not use prison labor to produce cheap goods, and balance exports and imports in PRC-U.S. commodity turnover (our country has also encountered similar U.S. requirements).

The fact that Chinese exports to the United States exceed U.S. imports (by $10 billion according to U.S. figures), along with China's unauthorized use of computer software and other intellectual property (Hong Kong and Singapore were also guilty of this at one time), has generated particular recriminations.

However, you get the impression that it is not only a matter of entrepreneurs' grievances and legislators' stubbornness. The U.S. Administration itself seems to have decided to toughen up its position with regard to the Chinese leadership. It is hardly a coincidence that at the height of the disputes over Most Favored Nation status, President Bush ostentatiously received the exiled Dalai Lama, which, needless to say, met with a pathological response in Beijing.

The Chinese side reacted properly but firmly to the toughening of the U.S. position. An official statement followed, saying that if Most Favored Nation status is withdrawn or if its extension is made conditional upon any terms, that will seriously damage not only Chinese-U.S. trade and economic ties but also bilateral relations on the whole. Moreover, it will be a mutual loss. Other states will immediately seize the U.S. share of the Chinese market. While U.S. consumers of Chinese goods, high-quality school uniform, for instance, will have to pay 1.5 times more for it.

As for problems of bilateral trade, there is above all a difference of statistics. According to Washington's figures, Chinese exports to the United States total $15.2 billion, while, according to Beijing's figures, they only total $5.2 billion. China claims that the United States is wrongfully including in this sum Chinese goods or semi-manufactures acquired, processed, and then reexported by Hong Kong. As for imports from the United States, they have indeed dropped over the last two years for a number of reasons, notably due to Washington's sanctions and bans on the export of high-technology output, although Beijing has not taken similar retaliatory steps.

To what can we attribute the tightening of position as regards the Chinese leadership, if not on the part of the White House then on Capitol Hill? A desire to test how China will respond to pressure when, in the view of certain Washington politicians, there is still only one world superpower. Professor Warren Cohen of Michigan University noted in the weekly WORLD MONITORING that China's strategic significance for the United States has diminished with the end of the "cold war." So this is a contentious issue. However, in connection with the problem of Most Favored Nation status Beijing unequivocally indicated that it will not allow ultimatums and will not tolerate encroachments on its sovereignty.

I would like to hope that common sense prevails in Washington and that the current disagreement with Beijing is overcome to their mutual advantage. There is no point in returning to the era of "strategic triangles" when alienation between Moscow and Beijing immediately brought Beijing and Washington closer together and vice versa. The normalization of Sino-Soviet relations supplements the end of Soviet-U.S. confrontation, since both these processes are integral elements of the new world order.

Northeast Asia

Japan Views Gorbachev Invitation by G-7

LD3005042691 Moscow TASS in English 1928 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Tokyo May 29 TASS—A leading official of the Japanese Foreign Ministry today spoke out in favour of a likely participation of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in the forthcoming Group of Seven (G-7) summit, to be held in London in July, "before or after main discussions."

The official emphasised that consent of the leaders of all G-7 countries was necessary for that and that consultations to this effect were under way, the KYODO TSUSHIN NEWS AGENCY reports.

At the same time the official, whose name is not given by the news agency, expressed a negative opinion about the Soviet president's participation in the G-7 summit proper. At present there is no question of inviting Gorbachev to the summit itself, the official emphasised.

Until recently, the Japanese Foreign Ministry favourably regarded the idea of inviting Gorbachev for direct participation in the London summit, considering it necessary to examine the Soviet Union's economic and internal political problems.

Today's statement followed a joint news conference of Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu and his Canadian counterpart Brian Mulroney, who was in Tokyo on an official visit, here on Tuesday.

The two prime ministers expressed the view that the Soviet leader might be invited to London to meet G-7 leaders "at the close of main discussions".

Japan Position on Visits to Northern Territories

LD3005102991 Moscow TASS in English 0926 GMT 30 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Yegorov]

[Text] Tokyo May 30 TASS—Seeking to settle the "northern territories" problem as soon as possible and to step up Soviet- Japanese contacts, the Japanese Government on Wednesday decided to open talks with the Soviet side in June to begin visa-free trips by Japanese citizens to the disputed islands of the South Kurile chain and by Soviet citizens, living there, to Japan.

At the same time the Japanese Government made a preliminary definition of its position on this issue: the right of visa-free visits to "the northern territories" is given to Japanese when they go on trips not connected with trade and economic issues, that is former residents of these islands, representatives of the press, mass organisations, etc.

A similar approach will be applied to Soviet citizens, living now on the four disputed islands, when they visit Japan.

The idea of making visa-free visits by citizens to "the northern territories" was put forth by president Mikhail Gorbachev during his recent visit to Japan. The decision by the Japanese Government on visa-free visits on a "mutual basis" is the first response by the Japanese leadership to the Soviet initiative.

Commentator Views DPRK's UN Decision

SK2905114491 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1200 GMT 28 May 91

[From "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] Following is an article by station commentator Vyacheslav Chernukha on the DPRK's decision to apply for UN membership:

This decision was described as "inevitable" in a Foreign Affairs Ministry statement issued in Pyongyang. As was noted, the decision was made to overcome the temporary difficulties created by the ROK authorities. A ROK decision announced toward the end of last year on applying for a UN membership was referred to in the statement.

According to the view of the DPRK Foreign Ministry, for the two Korean states to become members of this organization will constitute another great obstacle on the road toward reunification of the country divided following the end of World War II. In the statement, Pyongyang (?said it cannot let the South unilaterally handle matters of interest to the entire Korean people at the world organization). Unquestionably, the entry of the two Korean states into the United Nations will be (?reflected in the existing facts).

I am also convinced that this will not lead to perpetuating the division of the country. Conversely, the participation of both Pyongyang and Seoul in major international organizations is capable, I imagine, of developing the rapprochement between the two sides, the beginning of which had been provided by the two sides' premiers at their talks last year.

If the delegations of the two Koreas were to find a way of mutual function at the United Nations, it undoubtedly will help the two sides reunify their country.

I am convinced that sooner or later a delegation of a single Korea will occupy its seat in the United Nations.

Conference on Problems in Northeastern Asia Ends

LD3005043491 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Prokhorov]

[Text] Tokyo May 29 TASS—An international conference on the problems of Northeastern Asia ended in Tokyo today. It discussed ways to improve the economic situation in the region and the development of all-round ties between the countries of Northeastern Asia in order to establish a new order in this region. Participants included prominent political scientists, economists and high-ranking military officers from the United States, Japan, China, Mongolia, South Korea, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the Soviet Union.

The conference was organized by the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI and the George Washington University jointly with the IZVESTIYA newspaper.

The speakers noted that the Soviet Union plays an important role in the region. They also expressed concern over the unstable political situation in the USSR and the deterioration of its economy, noting that these factors influence the situation in Northeastern Asia. Speaking of the necessity to render economic aid to the Soviet Union, many participants pointed to the non-effective use of such aid, to the absence of clear guarantees and responsible partners as well as the continuing unclarity about the powers of various steering bodies.

The conference heard reports on the policies of the U.S., China and the Soviet Union in the region. Speakers stressed that the improvement of Soviet-Chinese relations is a major factor for peace and stability in the region. They noted that there is progress in dialogue on the Korean peninsula. There were many critical remarks on the presence of American troops in the region and the stationing of nuclear weapons on the Korean peninsula. A lot of attention at the conference was paid to questions of economic cooperation and the establishment of a free economic zone in the Sea of Japan area.

Air Traffic Agreement Signed With ROK

LD2905133591 Moscow TASS in English 1243 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Yegorov]

[Text] Tokyo May 29 TASS—Representatives of the Soviet Union and the Republic of Korea signed in Seoul today an agreement on regular air communication. Under the document, which comes into force immediately after being signed by South Korea's Foreign Minister Lee Sang Ok and Soviet Civil Aviation Minister Boris Panyukov, the sides will give each other the right of unimpeded flights in their air spaces, transit flights over their territories, as well as cancel taxation of deliveries of aircraft equipment, spare parts and aviation fuel.

The agreement was initialled this March, giving the green light to the first commercial flights between the two countries. When implemented in full, it will allow Aeroflot and Korean Airlines to make two flights a week between Moscow and Seoul in 1991 and three flights in 1992.

According to local news analysts, the agreement will allow the Korean airlines to make transcontinental flights to Europe by a short route and lure a considerable number of passengers in northeastern Asia thanks to low fares.

Taiwan Holds Economic Seminar in Moscow

OW2905054891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] The Chung Hua Institution for Economic Research, Taipei, and the Institute for Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences are holding a seminar in Moscow on prospects of bilateral trade. Attended by around 100 Taiwan business people and nearly 300 Soviet industrial representatives, including state-owned factories in the military and industrial complex and small private firms, this is the first ever meeting on such a level in the history of Soviet-Taiwan relations.

The Soviet Union does not have diplomatic relations with Taiwan and has never officially recognized the nation, but, according to many soviet participants in the seminar that opened on Tuesday, trade with one of the Pacific tigers has promising prospects.

Taiwan reports that trade between the two countries reached $52 million over the 11 months of 1990.

It was originally expected that a governmental delegation under Taiwan's deputy premier would take part in the Moscow meeting but this plan did not materialize.

Nevertheless, the forum that is to last for at least three days will not be without Soviet official representation: It will be attended by the representative of Russia's Foreign Economy Ministry, the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the USSR State foreign Economic Commission.

The Taiwan participants hope to establish profitable contacts with the Soviet enterprises having advanced R&D projects that cannot go into production due to insufficient funds. Taiwan is also interested in Soviet raw materials sources.

Other proposals that Taiwan expects to excite Soviet interest are supplies of consumer goods, first of all, electronics, textiles and footwear.

Near East & South Asia

No Date Yet for Next 'High-Level' Israel Talks

PM2905115591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[G. Charodeyev report: "Cuban Troops Withdrawn From Angola. From Our Correspondent at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Excerpts] Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, has held a routine briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. [passage omitted]

A U.S. television journalist inquired: Are there plans for Israel's foreign minister to visit the USSR and is such a visit advisable now?

"I have not heard the Israeli foreign minister say he intends to visit our country," V. Churkin stressed. "During USSR Foreign Minister A. Bessmertnykh's stay in Israel, however, the Israeli side expressed interest in maintaining direct contact with the Soviet Union so that we can together seek ways toward a Near East settlement. This wish on the part of the Israeli side met with understanding from the Soviet minister. I therefore think that direct high-level contacts between the USSR and Israel should not be ruled out in the future. It is still too early to talk of the date and place for a possible meeting."

Radio Rossii Questions Death of Soldier in Gulf

LD2905141091 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1238 GMT 29 May 91

[Report by (Sergey Pustovoy)]

[Text] I have in my hands an interesting document. This is a copy of death certificate serial 2-Zhd no. 377/986, issued by the Ilichevsk town register office, Odessa Oblast, on 11 December last year. The deceased is Yuriy Vitaliyevich Novysh, serviceman on complusory duty. At the age of 19 he died, as the certificate states, on a ship in the Persian Gulf. But the most puzzling thing seems to be the cause of death given in the certificate. This is rapid putrefaction in the corpse—that's how it's written in the certificate.

But how are we to understand this? The confusion in the cause-and-effect chain is so blasphemous that it recalls the film Horrors of Zombies at large in the world. In the sphere of the rational, decomposition of the corpse, as a rule, takes place after the death, and so cannot be its cause. But it's another aspect that strikes me as interesting. Such a record even casts doubt on the veracity of other data recorded in the death certificate. In particular, the date of death—19 October 1990. According to (Lyubov Vymer), member of the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers, Yuriy Novysh's body was handed over to his parents only four and a half months after this date, actually, at the end of February 1991. That is, at the time when hostilities had ended in the Persian Gulf. (Nikolay Moskovchenko), chairman of the Moscow branch of the Shchit union [soldiers trade union], who handed me this document, voiced a supposition in connection with this—that Yuriy Novysh could have been killed in the course of hostilities in Kuwait or Iraq. It is common knowledge that Soviet troops didn't take part in any engagements on the side of the multinational forces. At the same time, it is also known that Saddam Husayn was using the services of Soviet military advisers at this time. The supposition is inviting—it is probable that serviceman on compulsory duty Yuriy Novysh died in Iraq defending the interests of the Saddam Husayn regime, and the falsified certificate of his death is just an attempt to conceal this fact from the public. I wonder how many more of our boys will dies as a result of putrefaction in the corpse of Soviet communist totalitarianism?

Consultations in Moscow on Afghanistan

Talks with Pakistan

OW3005075591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 29 May 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature]

[Text] DP's [Diplomatic Panorama's] Igor Porshev asked the Soviet Foreign Ministry's senior staffer, ambassador-at-large Nikolay Kozyrev for comments on the results of the consultations on Afghanistan that had been held in Moscow (Kozyrev was one of the participants).

The entire spectrum of the Afghan settlement was extensively covered during consultations with the general director of the USSR and Afghanistan Department of the Pakistani Foreign Ministry Mohammad Khan, said Kozyrev. The consultations indicate that the USSR and Pakistan agreed on a large body of issues, including the need for a political settlement in Afghanistan as the problem defies a military solution, according to the participants in the consultations. It is clear now that none of the rival factions have an advantage and that further bloodshed is senseless.

Special emphasis was laid on the need for a settlement satisfying all Afghans who shold have the final say on all the Afghan problems. In other words, Afghans themselves must resolve all their outstanding problems, including the transition period and the conduct of negotiations. So far as other countries involved in the settlement process are concerned—the USSR, the USA, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Iran—all they are supposed to do is help the Afghans to find a common ground, in fact, urge them to do so, but not solve all the issues for them. The negotiators saw eye to eye on this matter in Moscow, emphasized the diplomat.

Support was also reiterated of the principles of the Afghan settlement stated in the UN secretary General's May 21 statement, says Kozyrev. According to him, there were no disagreements on this point.

However, the consultations brought to the surface a host of issues, including guite substantial ones, on which the Soviet Union and Pakistan take divergent lines. Difference No. 1 is probably in what construction the sides put on the transitional period and the transitional mechanism. The Soviet Union believes that all the Afghan political forces without exception should take part both in the creation of Afghanistan's future structures, i.e., an election, and in the preceding preparatory work.

The rebels are known to rule out the possibility of Najibullah and other current Afghan leaders' participation in the intra Afghan dialogue as well as that of their playing any role in the future setup of Afghan society. The rebels demand their departure from the political arena even before the transitional period is over. The Soviet Union cannot by any means agree to such a scenario, emphasized Kozyrev. Not until after the election will the attitude of the Afghans be clear. An election is in fact a key to any just or comprehensive settlement in Afghanistan.

There were other differences too, including a cease-fire and an end to arms supplies, said the diplomat. Pakistan is convinced that all these issues should be addressed in a package while the Soviet Union insists that the first steps to a cease-fire (even if only in a number of provinces) could be undertaken already today.

The diplomat confirmed that the Moscow consultations also touched on "negative symmetry". We believe, he said, that the question can be resolved even now, but only in a package the cease-fire must be concurrent with an end to all Soviet, U.S., Pakistani, and Saudi Arabian arms deliveries to the warring sides. Agreement has been reached in principle between the Soviet Union and the United States on this issue. It is now up to Pakistan and Saudi Arabia to make a move. Until recently, Riyadh did not give any signal as to its intentions. However, said Kozyrev, we plan to meet soon with Saudi Arabia's representatives and discuss the issue. All Pakistan promised in this connection was that it will make sure of the Saudi line and let Moscow know it.

Another major item on the agenda was Pakistan's aid in the search for and liberation of the Soviet POWs in Afghanistan. Pakistan views this issue as purely humanitarian. Islamabad does not link it with a political settlement in Afghanistan the way the rebels are attempting to do. According to Kozyrev, the Pakistanis gave assurances that they would continue efforts to make progress on the matter in the near future.

The diplomat agreed that Pakistan's line on the Afghan settlement has changed for the better in recent times. According to him, Islamabad is demonstrating an interest in maintaining regular contacts on Afghanistan and a willingness to seek political solutions. We welcome this willingness, but this, said the Soviet negotiators in no uncertain terms, should translate into practical action, emphasized Kozyrev. But on balance, says Kozyrev, it is apparent that Pakistan "has been warming to a political settlement."

In Moscow, the negotiators agreed to meet once again next July; the venue may be Islamabad.

Further on Discussions With Pakistan

LD3005042391 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 29 May 91

[By diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—A Soviet spokesman commented at a news briefing in Moscow today on the results of Soviet-Pakistani consultations in Moscow on May 27-28, regarding the political settlement in Afghanistan.

From the Pakistani side, the discussions were attended by Riyaz Mohammad Khan, director general of the Pakistani Foreign Ministry's Department for the Soviet Union and Afghanistan.

An exchange of views, the diplomat said, revealed a commonality of the sides' attitudes to several issues, in particular, towards the need to attain a settlement acceptable for all Afghans, put an end to war and the extermination of the civilian population. The sides stressed that priority in settling the Afghan problem should belong to Afghans themselves, while other countries can only help them achieve relevant agreements.

The Pakistani side reaffirmed its readiness to facilitate a search for and release of Soviet POWs in Afghanistan and said certain concrete results could be attained quite shortly.

The next round of consultations will be held in Islamabad.

Azerbaijan-Israel Communique Signed in Baku

LD2905200491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1716 GMT 29 May 91

[By Azerinform-TASS correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku, 29 May (TASS)—Concrete ways to develop and implement ties and the expansion of contacts at various levels between the Republic of Azerbaijan and Israel are mapped out in a joint communique signed here by Ayaz Mutalibov, president of Azerbaijan, and Yuval Ne'eman, Israel's minister of science and technology, energy and infrastructure. He is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

I hope, the Israeli minister said while signing the communique, that our relations will continue to develop. Azerbaijan is a fairly close neighbor of ours, and we attach important significance to our friendship. There is no doubt that our ties are aimed at establishing stability and cooperation in the region.

Soviet Mideast Diplomacy Efforts Examined

91UF0774A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 20, 22 May 91 p 4

[Article by correspondent Sergey Medvedko: "Lose? Draw? Win?"]

[Text] Damascus—**Was the visit by USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh to countries of the Near East successful or unsuccessful?**

I could not get an unambiguous answer to this question from Soviet diplomats. If we talk about the results of the minister's talks with the leaders of Syria, Jordan, Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia on questions relating to bilateral relations between the USSR and each of the countries named, then the success is obvious. But if we are talking about the main purpose—convening a Near East peace conference—then the best that can be said is that there was, to use the fashionable term, "movement." True, one of our highly placed diplomats answered me in a definite and concise manner: "I cannot talk about success, no one won—it was a draw!" Syrian Foreign Minister Farouk al-Shara' was no more optimistic: "No progress was recorded."

So what was noteworthy about the trip made by the head of the Soviet foreign policy department? It was the first time since the end of the Persian Gulf war that Soviet diplomacy has moved actively into the Near East. For the first time in history a Soviet foreign minister visited the two states of Saudi Arabia and Israel.

One other noteworthy detail: The simultaneous visits to the region by the Soviet minister and American secretary were not happenstance. For what was probably the first time a certain division of labor was established between the Soviet Union and Washington, or rather a division of tasks or spheres of activity: the former "worked" on Syria, the latter on Israel for the purpose of bringing the positions of these main parties involved in conflict closer together.

Both Soviet and American experts are agreed that Damascus has moved a long way down the road toward the convening of a conference, demonstrating "flexibility and constructiveness," while Tel Aviv's stance has been "very stiff." On the eve of the arrival of Baker and Bessmertnykh in the region, Israel announced its latest plan to build 36,000 houses on occupied Arab land for Jewish immigrants. At the same time statements were issued on its refusal to hold talks with the United Nations and the impermissibility of creating an independent Palestinian state. At the height of the trips by the two ministers to the region, the head of the Israeli cabinet, Shamir, announced this: "We will not leave Jerusalem, nor Eretz- Israel (the sector of the Gaza and the west bank of the River Jordan)."

Israel's intractability has prompted many observers to talk about the failure of diplomatic efforts by the United States and USSR. Nevertheless, there was progress. In the words of one highly placed Soviet diplomat, Bessmertnykh and Baker consider the present situation unique. For the first time all the direct participants in the Arab-Israeli conflict are expressing a readiness to initiate a dialogue with each other, even if they are still on different platforms. Virtually no one is showing a negative attitude toward a peace conference.

I would categorize the Soviet-American rapprochement in the Near East as one undoubted success from Bessmertnykh's trip. During the course of the conflict in the Persian Gulf, for what was virtually the first time the USSR and the United States were not on opposite sides of the barricade. However, it also cannot be said that they shared the same foxhole: The USSR refused even symbolic military participation on the allies' side in the fighting to restore justice. After the war the Americans evidently decided to demonstrate that they could win the

peace and well as the war, with the aid of diplomacy. But in fact, the restoration of peace, particularly in the Near East, was beyond the United States, even with all its allies, without the Soviet Union. Moscow has trump cards such as closer relations with a number of the Arab countries and the Palestinians, without whom any settlement is impossible. And so for two-and-a-half months since the end of the war the Soviet Union has been involved in the diplomatic battles. This time it really is in the same foxhole as the Americans—the foxhole of the diplomatic fight for peace. We cannot win this battle alone. It is only by acting together that the two powers can break down the psychological barriers among their Near East allies. And achieve peace in a place where there has been none for more than 40 years.

Commentary Denies Deteriorating Ties With India

BK2805141391 Moscow Radio Moscow in Hindi 1300 GMT 28 May 91

[Commentary by Oleg Alekseyev]

[Text] While trying to strengthen relations with Beijing, Moscow is even ready to sacrifice its traditional friendly relations with New Delhi. This view was expressed recently in an editorial by an Indian newspaper, THE INDEPENDENT.

After reading these comments by THE INDEPENDENT, I once again carefully studied the joint Sino-Soviet communique [on Jiang Zemin's Moscow visit] because, according to THE INDEPENDENT, the communique provides proof of the cooling of Soviet attitudes toward India, and that proof is that the communique did not once mention India. It is true that the communique did not mention India, but neither did it mention many other countries with which the Soviet Union maintains traditional friendly relations. So, does this mean that the Soviet Union is also ready to sacrifice its ties with these countries to appease China. The question arises as to whether we are going too far by putting forward such arguments.

The communique is a document relating to bilateral Sino-Soviet ties, and it would have been strange and unnatural if it did not mainly concern Sino-Soviet cooperation and define the objective of further promoting it. Even while exchanging views on international issues, only those aspects of world diplomacy were emphasized in which the Soviet Union and China can cooperate to normalize the situation. For example, the Soviet Union and China can greatly contribute to the resolution of Cambodian, Korean peninsula, and Persian Gulf issues. Another significant thing to note is that the new Sino-Soviet communique says that the principles envisaged in the 1989 Sino-Soviet communique continue to be practiced. The 1989 communique said the Soviet Union and China will develop their relations in such a way that it does not hurt their relations with other countries. That is why the allegation that the Soviet Union has changed its traditional policy of friendship with India is totally baseless.

The Soviet Union greatly appreciates India's significant contribution in the consolidation of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. It was not a coincidence that while visiting Japan, Mikhail Gorbachev categorically declared that the Soviet Union attaches great importance to its cooperation with great countries like China, Japan, and India in the interests of peace.

Yanayev Receives Afghan Ambassador for Talks

LD2205193591 Moscow TASS in English 1824 GMT 22 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 22 TASS—Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev today met Mohammad Daud Razmyar, the ambassador of the Republic of Afghanistan to the Soviet Union.

The state of and prospects for further development of Soviet- Afghan versatile cooperation and matters connected with a political settlement in Afghanistan were discussed in a friendly atmosphere.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Angola Signs Fishing Cooperation Protocol

LD2405174991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1303 GMT 22 May 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Zubkov]

[Text] Luanda, 22 May (TASS)—Angola and the USSR signed a fishing cooperation protocol for the years 1991-92 on 21 May.

The document envisages continuation of joint oceanographical research and work in the field of marine biology and technology of production of fish products. Under the protocol, the USSR will send to Angola ship repair specialists. The Angolan side will examine a proposal on the training in the USSR of its national cadres in the field of fisheries on commercial conditions.

The sides advocated the transformation of the USSR-Angolan fishing expedition, which has been operating in the Republic for many years, into a mixed commercial enterprise. In the past year, the joint expedition has caught in the Angolan economic zone about 124,000 tons of marine products, one-third of which was supplied to Angola and two-thirds to the USSR. From August 1991 to July 1992 inclusive, the catch quota was reduced to 80,000 tons.

Foreign Ministry Marks Africa Day

LD2405151191 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 24 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—The Soviet Foreign Ministry today arranged a reception for the heads of diplomatic missions of African states accredited in Moscow on the occasion of African Liberation Day.

A congratulatory message from President Mikhail Gorbachev to the heads of state and government and African peoples on the occasion of the salient date was read out at the reception.

Speaking at the reception, Deputy Foreign Minister Valeriy Nikolayenko confirmed the high appraisal of Soviet-African understanding and cooperation, which have been an important factor of international politics for a long time.

He noted that it is impossible to imagine the establishment of a new harmonious world order without the active participation of African countries. He expressed Soviet readiness for a broader political dialogue, active cooperation in various spheres and the development of traditionally friendly relations.

Nikolayenko pointed to the great role of the Organisation of African Unity in preventing and settling conflicts and establishing the mechanisms of economic and political cooperation.

In his reply speech, the doyen of the diplomatic corps in Moscow, Senegalese Ambassador to the USSR Pascal Sane expressed the interest of African countries in developing friendship and broader cooperation with the USSR, including Soviet participation in tackling difficult problems in Africa.

Commentary on South Africa's Peace Conference

MB2405160091 Moscow Radio in Afrikaans to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 23 May 91

[Commentary by Yuriy Zhuravlev—read by announcer]

[Text] On 24 and 25 May a conference will be held in South Africa on ways of ending the violence in the country's black townships. On the eve of the conference, however, there is much doubt being expressed about its usefulness. Many black organizations have refused to take part in the conference, which was convened by the De Klerk government. What are the reasons for this negative attitude? Yuriy Zhuravlev comments:

The South African state president, F.W. de Klerk, proposed a meeting of a wide spectrum of the political forces in the country, at which a plan of action and tactics could be formulated on how to end the faction fighting in the black community. A specific date was decided on.

From the beginning the idea did not have the support of the African National Congress [ANC] and several other political organizations. They maintain that the authorities can no longer be trusted. In addition the government is accused of failing in its duties. What is involved here?

First, two ultimatums by the ANC to the De Klerk government. The first deadline passed on 30 April. By that date the government was to have released all political prisoners and made possible the return of political exiles. This was not done. This fact is supported by the country's human rights organizations. According to their figures, there are still several hundred political prisoners in South African jails. As for the exiles who have returned to South Africa, the figures are laughably low when compared with the tens of thousands of people who fled the country for political reasons.

By 9 May the government was, according to the ANC, supposed to have carried out its constitutional duty of restoring law and order in black residential areas, dismissed two ministers, and banned the carrying of traditional African weapons. The government did give attention to the latter in some, but not by any means all, respects.

The ANC reacted by suspending involvement in talks with the government on the future of the country, and calling on its supporters to launch a mass protest campaign. A situation of confrontation arose in the country.

What is the position on the eve of the peace conference? President de Klerk has declared that the government is determined to carry out its initiative. He will, however, have few participants at the conference. Among the blacks, Inkatha leader Mangosuthu Buthelezi will be there; he is trying to fill an important position in the country's politics. A few bantustan leaders may also attend, but that is all. The ANC, PAC [Pan-Africanist Congress], Azapo [Azanian People's Organization], and many prominent religious figures and black businessmen have declared themselves unwilling to take part in the conference.

The central issue in South African politics at the moment is the ending of the violence in the black townships. If this issue is not resolved, it can lead the country to anarchy and chaos. South Africa's standing in the international arena will be seriously damaged for a long time. The process of democratic reform will be put on hold.

I believe, says Yuriy Yuravlov, that it is in the interests of everyone in South Africa to start dialogue as soon as possible on ways of ending the factional violence. It does not matter under whose leadership or what form it takes. The important thing is to set aside political ambitions. After all, the future of the country and its people hangs in the balance.

East Europe

Minister Gubenko Assails Polish Attitudes

LD2905190791 Warsaw PAP in English 1439 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Krakow, May 29—Soviet Culture Minister Nikolay Gubenko delivered a strong address at Wednesday's plenary debate of the CSCE cultural heritage symposium in Krakow.

After asking the delegates to rise to pay tribute to Soviet soldiers and Polish patriots killed in the liberation of Krakow, the Soviet minister explained that it was the effort of Soviet units under the command of Marshal Ivan Konev, whose monument was recently dismantled in Krakow, which saved the city from being blown up by the Nazis.

Many of the delegates gathered at the symposium rose with visible reluctance.

Next, referring to Premier Jan Krzysztof Bielecki's address to participants in the symposium, Minister Gubenko said that "he (the premier) danced the chechotka on the grave of socialism with the lightness of a weightlifter. It seemed to me that I was at a preelection rally and not at a symposium on cultural heritage," Gubienko complained.

The Soviet minister opined that some delegations attempted to use the symposium to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. He recalled the role of the Soviet Union in initiating the CSCE process and said that in the years to come a lot would depend on the success of Gorbachev's reforms in the Soviet Union.

Bessmertnykh Receives Bulgarian Aambassador

PM2405140591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh received Bulgarian Ambassador to the Soviet Union V. Velchev at the latter's request 21 May. There was a friendly conversation, during which there was a discussion of questions of the current state and development prospects of Soviet-Bulgarian relations, and of the state of affairs in the Balkans and in the European continent as a whole.

West Europe

Preview of Bessmertnykh Visit to Italy, Portugal

LD3005072791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0343 GMT 30 May 91

[Text] Today USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh will fly to Italy and Portugal. Viktor Levin, our diplomatic correspondent, will tell us about the aims of the visit:

[Begin Levin recording] In Rome the Soviet minister will hold talks with his Italian colleague, De Michelis. The idea of this meeting appeared at the last moment, just two days ago. But the idea itself was prompted by the events that are rapidly developing in Ethiopia. Our countries, the Soviet Union and Italy, have unique oportunities to demonstrate good will and to assist in seeking accord and peace in the region of the Horn of Africa. The situation there is changing hourly. A week ago when Giulio Andreotti, head of the Italian Government, was discussing this problem with USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Moscow, it was already clear that the Mengistu regime was doomed, but at that time it was difficult to foresee that the rebels would gain the upper hand in the very near future. Now they are in command in Addis Ababa, but as experts note, their ranks are united only by an aspiration to overthrow Mengistu.

As for the views regarding the future of Ethiopia, there are more differences than accord there. This raises a whole number of problems. It is not only useful but, it seems to me, necessary for Bessmertnykh and De Michelis to exchange views on them. In Lisbon the Soviet minister, together with Portugese Prime Minister Cavaco Silva, UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will take part in the ceremony to sign a peace agreement on Angola. This is not simply a gesture of diplomatic courtesy, but the reflection of the positive role of the cooperation among Portugal, the USSR, and the United States of America, as well as the general mood of the world community in favor of a political solution in the spirit of new thinking. The agreement, which will be signed by Dos Santos, president of the People's Republic of Angola, and Savimbi, leader of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola, the opposition Angolan organization, is intended to put an end to the fratricidal war which has gone on for more than 15 years.

In a recent statement by the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, hope was expressed that this time common sense will triumph in Angola solidly and finally. But nobody thinks that the end of the war will solve all the problems. It seems that these problems will be under discussion at the forthcoming meetings among Bessmertnykh, Dos Santos and Savimbi.

From the above, it follows that an African accent sounds rather noticeably in the visit by Bessmertnykh. In Lisbon conversations between Bessmertnykh, President Soares, the prime minister, and the Portuguese Foreign Minister Pinheiro will take place. A lot of time is given to them. It is sufficient to say that today, having spent most of the day in Rome, Bessmertnykh intends to start an exchange of opinions with the Portuguese leaders immediately after his arrival in Lisbon, though it will happen beyond the framework of a normal working day. On Friday meetings and talks will continue. On Saturday, still in Lisbon, Bessmertnykh will hold talks with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. It is expected that at these talks

solutions to the remaining problems on reducing conventional weapons will be found. In the event of success, in my view, it is not exluded that Bessmertnykh and Baker will name the specific date of the Soviet-American summit. [end recording]

ADN—Germany Plays 'Key Role' in Development

LD2805115791 Berlin ADN in German 1033 GMT 28 May 91

[Excerpts] Moscow (ADN)—Bonn and Moscow are aiming for close cooperation in their economic relations. At the recent talks Federal Economics Minister Juergen Moellemann held in Moscow, international economic and financial problems were a central issue, apart from various bilateral questions. The Federal Government takes the view that the Soviet economic reforms have produced the preconditions for a stronger involvement of the USSR in the world economy, Moellemann told his interlocutors.

Germany sees itself in a key role for this process. This was also expressed clearly by Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl during his recent visit to Washington. In support of the reforms, Bonn and Moscow want to speed up the rapprochement and the integration of the Soviet Union into organizations like GATT, OECD, the IMF, and the World Bank. This also applies to the conclusion of a cooperation agreement between the EC and USSR. [passage omitted]

Currently the Federal Government is considering a number of projects for extending the cooperation. It wants to support the Soviet wish to increase exports to Western markets. Circles in the German economy have plans for an eastern trade exchange in Berlin. The trade support office of the German Embassy in Moscow has been extended. At the EC, Bonn will work for the abolition of trade restrictions. [passage omitted]

Soviet-EC Commission Talks in Brussels

LD2405153591 Moscow TASS in English 0917 GMT 24 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergei Simonenko]

[Text] Brussels May 24 TASS—The second meeting of a joint Soviet-EC Commission, which ended in Brussels on Thursday, produced promising, concrete results, according to chief Soviet negotiator Deputy Foreign Minister Ernest Obminsky.

The meeting of the commission, set up in accordance with an agreement on trade, commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the European Communities which entered into force last spring, helped expand bilateral contacts begun in Moscow in May 1990.

Participants in the meeting signed a memorandum to grant 250 million European Currency Units [ECU] worth of food aid to the Soviet Union.

The sides charted ways of implementing an EC programme of technical assistance to the Soviet Union for which 12 EC countries will allocate 400 million ECU.

The commission reached an agreement to begin talks in the near future to sign agreements in the sphere of nuclear energy.

Several committees were set up to help implement Soviet reforms in various economic areas.

The meeting also discussed Soviet economic reforms.

Andreotti Cited on Moscow Visit Results

LD2405195791 Moscow TASS in English 0916 GMT 24 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Teterin]

[Text] Rome May 24 TASS—Support for perestroyka, the success of which is the key factor not only for the Soviet Union, should be of political character, Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti said in an interview on the results of his short working visit to Moscow, published by the Rome-based IL TEMPO newspaper today.

Andreotti noted that, in his opinion, a meeting between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and the heads of the G-7 in London would be useful due to the following three reasons.

Firstly, world nations are now living through a delicate time created by the present situation after the end of the Gulf crisis. This topic will be central at the coming discussion of the international situation.

Secondly, it is difficult to by-pass the Soviet Union in tackling such issues as environment and narcotics control. Last but not least, it is in common interests to support Gorbachev's policy experiencing difficulties.

Asked what the most dangerous moments are for Gorbachev's policy of reforms at present, Andreotti said: "It is a difficult thing to make the policy of pluralism a prevailing one in a country, which has never known it.

"It was quite natural that all differences would surface and nationalist feelings would take the upper hand when the Soviet people received the right to speak and write. In addition, it is a difficult thing to switch to a mixed and market economy."

"I believe that the greater part of the Soviet people are convinced of perestroyka's irreversible nature," he noted. "This conviction was confirmed by Soviet military leaders," he added.

Andreotti dismissed the newspaper's doubts about the USSR's solvency. He also stressed: "The Soviet Union is not the biggest debtor. In addition, it has appropriate resources. Foreign investors are offered to purchase shares. Besides, laws on guarantees and privatisation are now being compiled."

Forces Seek To Leave Germany 'With Dignity'

PM2705133391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 May 91 First Edition p 5

[Interview with L. Sharin, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Defense and Security Committee, by correspondent Ye. Grigoryev; date not specified; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction: "How to Pull Out: Withdrawal of Soviet Troops from Germany Should Not Harm Our Countries"]

[Text] Bonn—Strange as it may seem, in a certain sense taking troops into a place is simpler than bringing them home. In any event, the return of the Soviet troops from Germany, just like the planned withdrawal of the bulk of the Western allies' troops from that country, is beset by a host of problems. Ranging from economic and transport problems to political and psychological ones. This is a new phenomenon in the practice of Europe's political life.

The largest contingent returning from Germany is the Soviet Western Group of Forces. Thus it was logical for the International Center for Seminars and Symposiums to study and discuss the political, economic, social, ecological, and other aspects connected first and foremost with the withdrawal of our units. That was the aim of a special Soviet-German seminar organized in Bonn. Representatives of the FRG Government as well as the armed forces, parliamentary deputies, scientists, diplomats, and journalists from the two countries took part. The participants included L. Sharin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions.

"The seminar," he said in conversation with your correspondent, provided the first opportunity to discuss questions of our troops' withdrawal in an integrated way. And, to be blunt, there are many problems. Our committee has been working on them directly for almost two years now. As the seminar showed, it is no longer simply a question of putting reciprocal claims forward and examining them but of seeking ways to resolve emerging problems."

[Grigoryev] What ideas were expressed in this connection?

[Sharin] Let us take the economic aspect. Under the treaty, as is well known, the Germans allocated 7.8 billion marks for the construction on our territory of housing for the returning servicemen. It is worth noting here that the FRG has a great interest in ensuring the most productive use of these resources. Or take the concern for demobilized personnel. That would not seem to affect the German side. But here, too, we see the latter's desire to ensure the most effective use of the resources allocated to organizing vocational training for the demobilized soldiers. This means training in specialist subjects for which we have a very great need. Training centers will be built in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, and Alma-Ata. I, for example, have a whole portfolio of proposals from various German institutions and firms on cooperation in this matter. They, of course, are not averse to making money and are aware of the funds assigned to these projects. But who is not interested in that? I, too, would like preference to be given to Soviet firms and construction organizations when construction orders are placed.

[Grigoryev] Were questions of the attitude toward our troops in the new FRG laender discussed?

[Sharin] Yes, we said openly that there are problems here, including problems on the German side. Many of the seminar participants shared the idea that it is necessary to treat our troops fairly and really part as friends.

[Grigoryev] Did you not feel that the Germans would like to be rid of our troops that little bit sooner?

[Sharin] I did, and I understand them. Usually we work on the basis of our own viewpoint but, if you look at the problem through their eyes, the troop withdrawal is a major political bonus for those who are implementing this accord. We ourselves have an interest in this now as well. Since the disbandment of the Warsaw Pact our troops no longer serve any strategic purpose in Germany. Economically the Western Group of Forces is simply a drain on our resources.

Furthermore, combat training cannot be fully conducted in the Western Group of Forces in real conditions yet these, it may be said, are the elite of our armed forces. Under our new policy and new defense doctrine we cannot be interested in anything but the earliest withdrawal of the troops. That this is getting bogged down in transport and economic problems and especially housing problems is a different matter...

The Bonn seminar was a useful initiative. We will be dealing with the problems under discussion there for a number of years to come. The troop withdrawal is a difficult and in many ways intricate task. That is why the discussion centered on how we are to accomplish this politically, economically, and psychologically difficult process in such a way as to not only not harm the new relations between the Soviet Union and the unified Germany but also, conversely, to help strengthen and develop them. The basis for that is good, L. Sharin concluded.

Let me add to his conclusions the thought expressed at the seminar by the German General H. Fertsch, leader of the Bundeswehr group for liaison with the Western Group of Forces. He believes that the issue should be not of the withdrawal of the Soviet troops but of their "return home after fulfilling their mission." And the joint aim of this process for the German and Soviet sides alike must be to "return with dignity." One can only agree with that.

Soares Says Portugal Ready To Support Reforms

PM2705141591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by P. Golub: "Portugal Is Ready to Help. M. Soares Ends Visit to USSR"]

[Text] "The scale of the changes which are under way in the USSR is very impressive," President Mario Soares of the Portuguese Republic declared talking to journalists 22 May. He is visiting our country to take part in the first international "Peace, Progress, and Human Rights" congress in memory of A.D. Sakharov.

"It is impossible not to notice that the processes which are under way in the Soviet Union have come up against serious difficulties, but the progress along the road of democratization is evident and cannot leave anyone indifferent," M. Soares emphasized. "We have had important meetings with Soviet leaders—USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, and B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet—and we have come away convinced that the leadership of both the Union and of Russia is firmly committed to the principles of perestroyka which were proclaimed six years ago. Portugal intends to support your country within its possibilities."

"We do not rule out the possibility of Portugal's participation in programs to be implemented in line with the recently established European Bank for Reconstruction and Development," the president replied to a question about possible forms of his country's support for the changes in the USSR. "This may take the shape of credits, or direct financial assistance, or Portuguese companies' participation in joint industrial projects."

"We see broad opportunities for the development of bilateral relations. The present level of economic and cultural cooperation between our countries cannot be regarded as entirely satisfactory, and therefore we favor the all-around expansion of these ties."

"We have gained positive experience in the sphere of political cooperation. Documents on a cease-fire in Angola are expected to be signed in Lisbon at the end of May in the presence of the UN secretary general. A considerable role in achieving this agreement, which is of historic importance for Angola, was played by the concerted actions of Portuguese, Soviet, and American representatives. I hope that the experience which we have accumulated will help us in the further development of bilateral political ties. And I am convinced that a meeting on Portuguese soil with President Gorbachev, which we have agreed with him in principle, will give a major boost to the development of our cooperation."

Gorbachev Greets European Science Forum

PM2905140191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 May 91 Second Edition p 5

[Message from USSR President M. Gorbachev "To European Meeting of Scientists and Engineers in Helsinki"]

[Text] I greet your second international meeting on problems of new materials and technologies. There is profound meaning in the fact that it is in the Finnish capital, the motherland of the all-European process, that outstanding specialists in one of the key avenues of modern scientific and technical progress have gathered. This is your irreplaceable contribution to the building of a new Europe—a community of mutual understanding, trust, and the cooperation so necessary to all peoples.

I wish you fruitful work in the interests of science and man.

[signed] M. Gorbachev, USSR president.

Review of 'Second Russian Revolution' Series

PM2905153191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
25 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Article by G. Ivanov-Smolenskiy under the rubric "The World and Us": "The Second Russian Revolution"]

[Text] Such is the title of a documentary movie about the last six years or so in our history, made by the BBC Television Company. A screening of its first two episodes took place at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center.

This movie was viewed with equal interest by various people: Academician Tatyana Zaslavskaya and former KGB Chairman Viktor Chebrikov; movie producer Elem Klimov and former RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Chairman Vitaliy Vorotnikov; member of the Security Council Vadim Bakatin and writer Sergey Zalygin. The reason for this is simultaneously simple and complex. The British movie is about Russian history, about the period which it is customary to call "perestroyka." Moreover, the top state leaders—to whom, as a rule, we still have no access today—relate here their most decisive moments. (The first episode is called "Enter Gorbachev," the second—"The Struggle for Glasnost." Very soon four more episodes will be ready—about the "Yeltsin Affair," the First Congress of People's Deputies, the republics' "revolt," and the most recent events in our country.)

It is good that today we have all (or nearly all) become different—bolder and freer. But how did it all begin? What were we like, say, three years ago? Who helped, or rather who "allowed" us to change? Who fought for this and how did they do it? And what was the cost? Being tormented and perplexed by endless rows and problems, we hardly even mention this.

It is the movie which reminds us.

For example, Mikhail Gorbachev's election as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee... Today almost every obkom [oblast party committee] secretary considers it his duty to, putting it mildly, "give him a few tips" at a plenum, to moralize with him a bit. But in the British movie, Anatoliy Lukyanov tells how back then, when he was still deputy chief of the Central Committee General Department, he walked across the hall onto the rostrum and literally felt numbed suspicion emanating from the Central Committee members: For those sitting in the hall, he was the bearer of a great secret, he knew what the Politburo had decided. And here Georgiy Arbatov recalls how an airplane from the United States, in which Shcherbitskiy was flying, was delayed while the decisive plenum was going on in Moscow at that time. And when it became clear in the airplane who had become general secretary, it "suddenly" transpired that everyone was simply wonderfully disposed toward him. Though it is not only the average viewer's eyes that the movie opens to a great deal. According to several former Politburo members who attended the preview, the following fact, which Pavel Volskiy makes public in the first episode, was previously unknown to them: Andropov's "comrades-in-arms from the party"—Chernenko, Tikhonov, and Ustinov—had deleted a paragraph from his "will" behind the remaining top party leaders' backs. It mentioned the necessity to put Gorbachev forward for the leadership positions.

Who displayed what political will in the very recent dramatic upheavals of our history, and consequently, who was there, what forces there were, and what their potential was—this is what the movie sheds a little light on. The second movie about the struggle for glasnost leaves no doubt as to the fact that these upheavals really were dramatic.

Yes, today the tough guys can catcall openly at a demonstration organized by the president. But do we recall what, for example, the parade commemorating the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution was like (all of three and a half years ago)? Who was standing on the tribune at the mausoleum then? Did this ceremony not pass off completely in the spirit of the times of stagnation? And what did Yegor Ligachev say about the article "I Cannot Waive My Principles" directly after its publication and the general secretary's return from Yugoslavia? How did Aleksandr Yakovlev, essentially without any official blessing, give the "go-ahead" for the release of the movie "Repentance"?..

The series "The Second Russian Revolution" is about much that we still do not know, no longer remember, or do not wish to remember. And we may be grateful to its makers—Norma Percy, David Ash, Paul Mitchell, Masha Slonim, and Kate Clark. Grateful for a highly professional, persistent, and fair investigation. It is only a pity that the talk about screening it widely in our country is still a dim prospect (naturally through no fault of the British side).

Further Reportage on Thatcher Visit

LD2905104891 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, left Moscow for Leningrad this morning.

Thatcher's Moscow visit programme was packed, making it possible for her to meet and exchange opinions with Soviet leaders and become better acquainted with various aspects of the country's life.

On Monday morning, Thatcher met teachers and students of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Moscow State Institute of International Relations. She delivered a 30 minute lecture to would-be Soviet diplomats, expressing her views on the most important international problems and Soviet domestic policy.

Speaking of her vision of the situation in the USSR, Thatcher said that one should not underestimate the importance of the country's political reform. Stressing the USSR's immense successes in bringing about basic human rights—freedom of speech, conscience, movement and ownership.

Thatcher was received by President Gorbachev in the Kremlin in the afternoon. She noted the enormity of the changes that had taken place in the USSR owing to perestroyka, stressing that the whole world is interested in the success of perestroyka and history will pardon no one if the accomplishments over these years are lost.

Gorbachev spoke frankly in detail about the situation in the country, the projects and principles of reforming the union and overcoming the crisis.

On Tuesday morning, Thatcher was recevied by Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. The Soviet premier dwelt on the Soviet Government's measures to further the economic reform, form market structures and overcome crisis phenomena in the economy.

Thatcher's speech at the USSR Supreme Soviet's International Affairs Committee was a major item on her programme. Thatcher said that in her opinion the G-7 leaders could invite Soviet president Mikhail Gorbachev to their next meeting in London in July. Gorbachev could be a guest of the meeting, its associated participant, and take part in the discussion with the G-7 leaders, since such meetings provide a multitude of possibilities for informal communication.

Thatcher said the West was ready to grant the Soviet Union economic aid, provided it is used to carry out reforms but not to preserve the old system, and this aid will grow as the West becomes convinced that the transition to democracy, market principles and observance of human rights are irreversible.

In the afternoon Thatcher was received by Soviet Defence Minister Marshal Yazov.

The warm reception accorded to Thatcher in Moscow, illustrated how great the Soviet people's interest is in her as an outstanding politician, and a charming woman.

Ambassador to EC Presents Credentials

LD2905114991 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Simonenko]

[Text] Brussels May 29 TASS—Lev Voronin, Soviet ambassador to the European Communities, on Tuesday presented his credentials to Jacques Delors, president of the Commission of the European Communities.

The two men discussed the growing intensive dialogue between the Soviet Union and the European Community. Both sides stated with confidence that results of the session of the mixed USSR-EC Commission, which ended several days ago, testified to the two sides' firm intention to extend interaction in the most diverse spheres of cooperation.

The interlocutors exchanged views on the prospects, contents and implementation of the technical assistance programme by EC in implementing transition to a market economy in the Soviet Union.

It was noted that integration process in the Common Market and the renewal of the Soviet federation can help develop a common European space and realise the principles of the Paris Charter.

Dzasokhov, Legislators Arrive in Sweden

LD2905112691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1650 GMT 28 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Gorokhov]

[Excerpt] Stockhom, 28 May (TASS)—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, led by Committee Chairman Aleksandr Dzasokhov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived in Stockholm today at the invitation of the Swedish Riksdag (parliament). The delegation includes deputies Vladimir Karpov, the writer, and Svetlana Savitskaya, the USSR pilot-cosmonaut. The Soviet parliamentarians were met at the airport by Stig Alemyr, chairman of the Riksdag's foreign policy commission.

The delegation also had a meeting today with Riksdag speaker Thage Peterson. The conversation participants noted that the Soviet Union and Sweden are on the threshold of a significant event in bialteral relations: USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Stockholm. They expressed confidence that the forthcoming Soviet- Swedish summit talks will give a new dynamism to the two countries' good-neighbor ties, of which contacts between the legislative bodies are becoming more and more an organic part.

T. Peterson said that the Soviet Union reform process is being followed with greater interest in Sweden. If the problems which exist can be surmounted and the plans of perestroyka put into practice, that will have a positive effect on the whole international climate.

The sides exchanged information on the activities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Swedish Riksdag. Promising fields for mutual cooperation, including collaboration between committees and commissions of the two parliaments, were discussed at the level of concepts.

USSR's Ambassador in Sweden Nikolay Uspenskiy participated in the conversation.

The delegation also attended a plenary sitting of the Riksdag today.

In the evening, the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet met the kollektiv of Soviet institutions in Stockholm. [passage omitted]

Russian Parliamentarian Holds Talks in Paris

LD3005041991 Moscow TASS in English 2155 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Batyrev]

[Text] Paris May 30 TASS—Ramazan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Russian parliament's Council of Nationalities, visiting here, today met Andre Bellon, deputy chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the French National Assembly.

"We discussed the need to look for new forms of relations between the two countries in the light of current changes when the USSR's republics appear on the world arena as subjects of international relations," Abdulatipov told TASS.

It was pointed out that it was necessary to do preliminary work to prepare in advance for a situation that is emerging as a result of current changes, he said.

"The opinion of the French side is that we ourselves should preliminarily resolve the bulk of issues—this primarily concerns the delineation of competence between the Union and republics, making everything clear in this respect.

"Our intellocultors are concerned very much, of course, over the possibility of further destabilisation of the situation in the Soviet Union as a whole and in Russia in particular.

"We, for our part, believe that it is essential to gradually steer matters to a situation when many issues will be tackled by republics themselves," Abdulatipov said.

"It is impossible to make such transition at once. However, already now it is necessary to work on preparing it in order to foresee a future development of events.

"The most important thing now is to determine who possesses which powers. The Union remains the main subject, representing strategic interests in the international arena.

"We should work very thoroughly on matters concerning the role to be played by Russia and by the states that have proclaimed their sovereignty within Russia.

"With this end in view it is essential to define clearly both a Union treaty and a federative treaty within Russia as soon as possible. Then the necessary legal mechanisms, due to which it will be possible to develop cooperation in diverse forms, will be created," Abdulatipov said.

Supreme Soviet

USSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 28 May

LD2805221891

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 2050 GMT on 28 May, in its scheduled "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program, carries 57 minutes of recorded highlights of the proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow on 28 May.

The announcer says that the session opened with a question from deputies on whether Leningrad should change its name. It was decided that a referendum should be held. The announcer says that Kulikov and others asked about commemorating the Nazi attack on the USSR, but that the main business of the day was indexation of earnings.

Valeriy Fedorovich Paulman, minister of labor and social affairs, describes the details of the law on indexation of earnings. There are differences of earnings among the republics and differences in goods in the shops, he says. Countrywide uniformity is therefore impossible, he opines. Indexation should not be regarded as a universal panacea; it is a redistributive measure, it does not increase the supply of goods. The index will be based on real average purchases, not theoretical state prices, he concludes.

Deputy Zhuravlev says that the indexation bodies should be in close touch with the taxation bodies. The law should be allowed to pass its second reading as quickly as possible. Deputy Malkova follows saying that minimum guarantees of social security should be enshrined in the index system. Other deputies add their comments.

Deputies Albert Yakovlev and Bobritskiy also contribute to the debate. They says that pay should not be seen as absolute quantities, but as a proportion of the enterprises' earnings.

At 2142 GMT a vote is carried giving the law its fist reading and requesting committees to continue work in the light of the comments heard today.

The announcer concludes the program by saying that Deputy Premier Maslyukov spoke about enterprises functioning on the basis of licences. The program ends at 2144 GMT.

USSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 29 May

LD2905203391

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1845 GMT on 29 May, in its scheduled "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program, carries 61 minutes of recorded highlights of the proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 29 May.

The deputies give a first reading to the draft law on foreign investments in the USSR. Lukyanov is in the chair.

Premier Valentin Pavlov speaks. No country can function successfully in isolation, he says. The USSR needs additional sources of finance. Foreign investment is a key part of the development program. The USSR could, in theory manage by itself. But what would be the advantage? The process would be faster for foreign assistance. The policy has its pros and cons, needless to say. Soviet firms will resent foreign competition, but the Soviet economy will become fully integrated into the greater world economy.

The economy as a whole is developing uncertainly, Pavlov continues. The USSR's prices seem distorted when compared with world prices. The ruble remains unconvertible. So far, foreign investment has been largely unsupervised, speculation has become rife, giving foreign investment a bad name in the USSR. It is important to remove state control of economic activity. Foreign capital can help this process. Loans and credits have their disadvantages. They weigh on the balance of payments and increase the national debt. In any case, it is now very hard to obtain credit in the world's money markets. Legislation, however, must guide the process, so as to encourage the inflow of capital from outside. Foreigners are not very keen at the moment to sink their capital in the USSR owing to currently unfavorable conditions. In general, the rules that apply throughout the world as a whole should also apply in the USSR. The draft law under consideration aims to improve the conditions for foreign investment in the USSR. Pavlov goes on to review various legal issues.

Soviet bodies have often so far been very feeble as regards the defense of Soviet interests, Pavlov says. The law must be made to apply to the free enterprise zones so as to encourage the implementation of Soviet planning priorities. A coordinating body must be set up to deal with foreign involvement in the Soviet economy, he concludes.

At 1918 GMT Deputy Tabeyev described the deliberations of the committee that considered the draft law on foreign investment, drawing attention to the need for republican laws to avoid conflict with union law and with one another.

At 1929 GMT deputies table a number of amendments and proposals. Deputy Samarin speaks in favor of the law, saying that it would encourage western investors to believe that the USSR has no intention of reverting to its former behavior. Deputy Lukin warns of the dangers of the war of laws and then launches into various technical points of detail in the wording of the law. Deputies Orlov and Velikhov also speak.

At 1944 GMT the draft law passes its first reading. The announcer then summarizes the remainder of the day's

proceedings. tomorrow, deputies will meet in committees and permanent commissions. The program ends at 1946 GMT.

Supreme Soviet Debates Draft Investment Law

LD2905122991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1000 GMT 29 May 91

[Report by Kremlin correspondent Andrey Nikiforov]

[Text] Today, there is a joint sitting of the chambers here, in the Kremlin, and the deputies are discussing, at a first reading, the draft basis of legislation on foreign investments in the USSR. Deputies regard this as a major economic law. May I remind you that the original variant of the draft bill on foreign investments was submitted by the Ryzhkov government in August 1990. The bill has undergone substantial revision. You see how long it has been in committee and commissions. The main committee that revised it was the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the opinions of both Supreme Soviet committees and permanent commissions of the chambers, as well as a number of republic legislative acts in this sphere were considered. The fact is that legislative acts on foreign investments have already been adopted or are being drawn up for examination in some republics. They have been adopted, inter alia, in Kazakhstan, Belorussia, and Lithuania. A draft is ready in the Russian Federation but has not yet been examined. Many deputies have advocated opting not for a directly applicable law [zakon pryamogo deystviya], but taking as the basis the USSR legislation on foreign investments.

Today, Prime Minister Pavlov delivered the main report, presenting the draft law. The coreport was delivered on behalf of the committees and commissions by Tabeyev, deputy chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The law determines the conditions and procedure for carrying out economic activity by foreign capital on USSR territory. Additional advantages are granted to attract foreign investments. On the other hand, a number of restrictions are laid down for foreign investors, deriving from economic security considerations. Discussion of the bill has already been under way for about two hours, and I have not heard anything against the conception of this law. Everyone says it is, properly speaking, our strategic path. Deputy Samarin, who spoke, as ever, clearly and graphically, said it was shameful to get crumbs from abroad, and taking credits could lead to debt slavery; however, there is an acceptable third way, namely the way of attracting foreign investments.

We'll see. This law will probably be adopted at a first reading today.

Draft Investment Law Endorsed

LD2905132891 Moscow TASS in English 1234 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The USSR Supreme Soviet today endorsed at the first reading the draft fundamentals of the law on foreign investments. It presents foreign investors with no less favourable legal conditions than Soviet enterprises, and envisages broad guarantees for the protection of foreign investments.

The draft fundamentals permit the creation of enterprises with 100 per cent foreign capital. Meanwhile, the share of enterprises with the participation of foreign capital in their subsidiaries should not surpass 50 per cent. Soviet Premier Valentin Pavlov said that this is a precaution against the possibility of the creation of holding companies which can assume control over entire industries.

The draft law gives foreign investors the right of unlicensed export and import and exempts them from paying duties on import and export tax.

Virtually all the participants in the debate urged the early adoption of the draft law. They emphasized that it will create the necessary conditions for attracting foreign capital to the Soviet economy and will make it more open.

The usually vociferous opponents to the country's "capitalisation" who fear that the country will be "sold out" to foreigners were barely audible today. Leader of the influential conservative Soyuz group, Yuriy Blokhin, spoke in support of the draft law. Another member of Soyuz, Alexey Boyko, emphasized that all civilised countries compete for foreign investments.

Many speakers mentioned the need to coordinate the draft fundamentals and corresponding legal acts adopted by republics. Thus, Alexander Orlov, chairman of the USSR Control Chamber, said it is particularly important that all republics should conduct a single tax policy with regard to foreign investors.

Virtually the only opponent who spoke in the debate was Yefrem Sokolov, former first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee. He said that the adoption of the draft will lead to the utter disintegration of the country and will turn it into a semi-colony, if not a colony. He said the draft enables foreigners to build and buy up everything and dismiss anyone.

The voting shows that Sokolov's viewpoint is shared by few people. As many as 291 deputies voted for the fundamentals at the first reading, 11 voted against and 21 abstained.

Political & Social

'Terrible Plot' Against Central Press Charged

PM2905211891 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 91 First Edition p 1

["On the Cabinet of Ministers Agenda"—PRAVDA Headline]

[Text] The subscription for next year is not yet due, but we, the central newspapers and journals, are already being "besieged" from all sides: Newsprint producers are frightening us with new prices, mail workers are intending to double the cost of their "services," and transport and telephone charges have gone up already. The Ministry of Finance is turning its empty pockets inside out and refusing to allocate hard currency to newspapers and journals for maintaining correspondents' bureaus abroad. It seems than no one in the state is interested in the readership.

Sector and local egoism is reducing the situation to an absurdity. It could be that we are excessively suspicious, but it looks as if a terrible plot is being hatched to do away with the central periodical press. Do you know what it is suggested that we should do to survive? Treble our prices for subscriptions and retail trade, and procure hard currency for correspondents' bureaus and duty tours for special correspondents from speculators or—and this essentially comes to the same thing—buy it at commercial prices.

We believe that this is no way out of the situation. After all, it would be a question of robbing virtually every family, and life for them is pretty hard already. Since this problem has become a nationwide problem, it should be tackled at a serious state level. Therefore we are asking that the Cabinet of Ministers be convened in order to, just once, comprehensively examine the whole block of questions connected with the future of the periodical press in the country.

[Signed] PRAVDA staffers.

Cultural Figures Call Off Central TV Boycott

PM3005083891 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 May 91 p 6

[Letter from Aleksandr Gelman and Andrey Smirnov: "Boycott Over"]

[Text] A group of cultural figures called for a boycott of Central Television 24 January this year as a mark of protest against political censorship and the obstructions that are being put in the way of setting up an independent Russian Federation television service. Dozens of writers, producers, and theatre, movie, and stage actors responded to this call and declared their support for the boycott.

The situation has now changed—Russian Television went on the air 13 May.

Needless to say, this does not free us from the need to continue the fight against any infringement of glasnost. However, bearing in mind the fundamental public significance of the appearance of an alternative channel of information, on behalf of the group that organized this action we declare an end to the boycott.

Aleksandr Gelman,

Andrey Smirnov,

Moscow.

PRAVDA Welcomes Court Ruling on Media

PM2905151491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Georgiy Ovcharenko article under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "The Law Is Not a Blunt Instrument..."]

[Text] Let us give our legislators due credit: They are doing everything possible to bring our lives and our relationships with the state and with each other within a legal framework. The number of new laws adopted by parliament runs into dozens.

But I think it is too soon to rejoice. Because even the lawyers today have difficulty finding their way around the labyrinth of laws constructed by our Supreme Soviet in its fervor of lawmaking. And this is not only because of the "war of laws," which brings about head-on collisions—enough to make the citizens' heads spin—between the legislative enactments of the center and the republics. The main thing is that our parliamentarians, while cooking up laws like pancakes on a conveyor belt, give too little thought to the monitoring of their implementation and, most important, an effective mechanism for their operation. All kinds of legal cases are arising from this.

Remember how everyone heaved a sigh of relief when the USSR Law "On the Press and Other Mass Information Media" came out. One the one hand the journalists were pleased: They were granted the right in law to express their own opinion on all kinds of events and access to virtually any information, and the law removed the gag imposed by the nomenklatura and by censorship. Citizens also were enthusiastic: The lawmakers had shown concern for their rights and interests too, by making journalists accountable for information published—and incidentally, a torrent of law suits against the mass media immediately started raining down upon the courts.

Fine, the reader will say: The court, as is only proper in a rule-of-law state, will decide who is right and who is culpable, and sort everything out according to the law. And I would share that view...if only the good law on the press were backed up by good executive orders and corresponding interpretations by the USSR Supreme Court plenum. But the people's courts have not been provided with either of these things. And they have been plunged into confusion, interpreting the provisions of the law as best they can.

Things have reached the point where courts have sometimes begun, contrary to the law, to make the preparation and publication of refutations of false reports incumbent upon those who published them, rather than those who disseminated them. This happened, for instance, with PRAVDA, which printed an article by

TASS observer V. Petrunya, "Shall We Harvest the Potatoes First?", which had been transmitted to the PRAVDA office by the agency. As Moscow's Sverdlovskiy Rayon People's Court later established, this item contained some information that was not in accordance with reality. But instead of making it incumbent on TASS, which disseminated this information—and not only to PRAVDA, incidentally—to prepare a refutation and transmit it to the newspapers, the court for some reason charged PRAVDA alone with this unpleasant function. But why should we answer for someone else's sins and mistakes?

We asked the USSR Supreme Court plenum that question, in the comment "On Whom Is the Law Binding?" And believe me, we were guided not only by righteous indignation that the court had distorted the provisions of the law on the press, but first and foremost by the fact that the rights and interests of the mass media, only recently granted to them by the legislators, are violated all too often.

To the credit of the country's Supreme Court, let me observe that it did not ignore the PRAVDA item. And its plenum adopted a corresponding resolution, which says, in part: "...If information disputed by the plaintiff was reproduced by the mass information organ from official announcements, speeches at meetings, or original broadcast speeches or obtained from news agencies (Article 38 of the USSR Law 'On the Press and Other Mass Information Media'), then the courts must summon to answer the case, along with the mass information organ's editorial office, the body or individual which was the source of such information. In that event the burden of proof that the information disseminated is true rests with the said body or individual."

Thus the law has triumphed, which is what we wanted. But the sense of satisfaciton is tinged with bitterness: Why does it take a critical newspaper article to ensure that the law is strictly fulfilled? And how many other new laws do we have that are interpreted even by the courts, let alone citizens with no legal education, in different ways depending, perhaps, on political convictions or pressure brought to bear by various forces? Would it not be better—to return to my starting point—to formulate explanatory executive orders and a mechanism for accurate and unconditional implementation of a law at the time that the law is prepared? Perhaps then we will see the end of the people's well-known saying that the law is a blunt instrument...

I have discussed this subject with many of the country's parliamentarians. And they all acknowledged that the USSR Supreme Soviet neglects this very important aspect of its activity...

Meanwhile, sessions of the republics' parliaments are in progress, forging new laws one after another, and the next USSR Supreme Soviet session, where many draft laws will be submitted for examination, is not far off now. So maybe our parliamentarians, before adopting a particular law, should think about how it will operate and be implemented.

First Issue of New KGB Monthly Published

91UF0778A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 22 May 91 p 2

[Report by Vladimir Zaynetdinov: "Under the Editorial Auspices of the KGB"]

[Text]Publishing activity is a choice occupation for many these days. Including...the KGB.

The Moscow branch of the KGB, together with the independent film studio Contact Film, established a small publishing enterprise called "Analytik Press." A monthly publication by the same name soon appeared. It will became a forum not only for "chekists" but also for sociologists, political scientists, economists, and culture and science personalities. A permanent rubric, "Special Services," will tell readers about our intelligence and counterintelligence activities, as well as about the special services of other countries.

The first issue of the ANALYTIK PRESS newspaper contains the results of a sociological survey on the attitude of the population of the RSFSR toward various organs of authority and political and social organizations. By the way, the attitude toward the KGB is quite good. In almost all regions covered by this survey no more than 40 percent of the population have a negative attitude toward this organization. The second issue of ANALYTIK PRESS is ready and will come out at the end of May...

What did Pestel think of the KGB? How does the CIA treat Soviet defectors? These, as well as the story of another "victim of conversion," are the contents of the latest special supplement to newspaper VESTI ZAMOSKVORECHYA—LUBYANKA, No. 14, prepared by the press group of Moscow chekists together with the VESTI ZAMOSKVORECHYA editors.

First Issue of Entrepreneurs' Newspaper Published

PM3005134091 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 91 p 1

[Unattributed report: "From 'Das Kapital' to KAPITAL"]

[Text] The first issue of a newspaper entitled KAPITAL was published today. The new publication is intended primarily for representatives of the burgeoning class of Soviet entrepreneurs.

However, even those who do not belong to the well-to-do class can find entertaining material here—for example, the life story of an "ordinary Soviet millionaire" or news about apartment prices.

The publishers have decided to refrain from using the services of Soyuzpechat [Main Administration for the Distribution of Printed Matter]. Practically the entire print run of the first issue—100,000 copies—has been bought up by "Alternativa," an independent association of distributors of press publications.

Magazine To Be Available Abroad On-Line

PM2405124191 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 17, 28 Apr 91 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Read MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI on Computer"]

[Text] In the next few weeks MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI will become the first Soviet newspaper to reach the reader not only off the printing press but also through a special channel—through the "on line" method. This means that it will be possible to view MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI's contents the day after publication by switching on your computer in the USSR or abroad.

This work is being done by "Sovinfolink"—one of the firms in the Soviet-U.S. "Dialog" joint venture, with which MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI has signed an agreement. "Sovinfolink" has great potential: For example, their U.S. partner—Mid Data Central—has clients in over 50 countries. In the first week after an issue of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI appears it will be possible to read its contents using a computer, after which they will transferred to a data base and the required text can be called up on the computer screen by date of publication, rubric, or key word.

"Sovinfolink," which gave a presentation at the Moscow business club recently, is preparing and transmitting through its own channels a weekly digest of the Soviet press. Client firms receive information about Soviet organizations, including informal organizations, and an economic data base.

Editors Warn Against New Party Witch-Hunts

PM2405140991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 91 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Latest Issue of Journal"]

[Text] The items in the eighth issue of the journal KOMMUNIST are prefaced by an editorial commentary on the social crisis the country is experiencing and the dangerous attempts to exploit difficulties and mistakes in order to reject the radical renewal of our society. The crazy year of 1937, the commentary notes, clearly shows where such hunts for "guilty parties" and "enemies" lead.

The journal marks the 50th anniversary of the attack on the Soviet Union with a polemical article by L. Lazarev on problems of the history of the Great Patriotic War.

The way in which Soviet women are looking for new paths of emancipation and participation in society's political, economic, and spiritual life are discussed by G. Sillaste.

The issue also publishes a paper by Z. Malkova entitled "Educational Development Around the World. What Stage Have We Reached?"; book reviews; a report on the opening of a permanent seminar for the party aktiv and people's deputies at the Contemporary Social Problems Institute, and other items.

Journal Views Soviet Defector Problem

LD2905192191 Mosocw All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Today's LITERATURNAYA GAZETA is conducting an investigation into our intelligence men who were attracted not to heroism but to the West. Despite the very strict secrecy, we have all heard of Guzenko, Lyalin, and other defectors from the main intelligence administration and the KGB. In the opinion of an expert writing in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, the number of these defectors is legion. A whole directory could be published. The expert considers that one of of the reasons for the situation is that we are not as tough as the West in vetting and training cadres.

Take the story of say, Oleg Spirin, in Lebanon. This is also reported in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. Many of those who knew him would confirm that he was permanently in a state of slight intoxication with a face the color of incandescent metal, as the militia protocol would put it. What more need one say?

As for the latest scandal, the scandal of Aleksandr Krapiva, an officer of Soviet military intelligence, who requested political asylum in Austria, the expert Mikhail Lyubimov considers that the KGB also bears responsibility for the Krapiva affairs because our army, in contrast to all civilized states, is served not by its own military counterintelligence but the third administration of the KGB. If only a parliamentary commission could be set up on the Krapiva case to assess the damage which he inflicted and draw conclusions for the whole system of security and keeping of secrets.

Incidentally, in the West every such case has compulsorily to be the subject of a parliamentary inquiry. LITERATURNAYA GAZETA hopes that the USSR KGB will comment on the problem of defectors in the near future.

Western 'Outdated Stereotypes' Rejected

LD2905223791 Moscow TASS in English 2137 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS political news analyst Sergey Kolesnikov]

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Soviet readers have got accustomed to receiving fresh issues of a magazine or a copy of survey on a highly topical subject containing

hopelessly outdated information and evaluations made half a year ago and sometimes even earlier than that.

The Western reader, it would seem, should not have such things due to up-to-date technologies for the distribution of information. However, articles that quite often appear in the West of late also strike a discordant note against the background of the latest developments.

In one case, a reputable German magazine publishes a prominent Soviet political figure's article styled in sharply confrontational tones at a time when the person himself prefers much more civilised vocabularly during contacts over the past two to three weeks.

In another case, evaluations of the state of affairs in the Soviet Union and of the activities of the president of the USSR are made, reflecting the views and positions characteristic of political battles at the beginning of this year, which participants in the polemic have already abandoned.

A forecast, made public in London recently by the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) and describing political development trends in the Soviet Union and East European countries, does not keep pace with the dynamically developing processes in Soviet society.

According to the FRANCE PRESSE news agency, the IISS report draws a conclusion that a predominant trend in the USSR is movement towards repressions and onslaught by the military, not towards democracy.

Quite familiar evaluations, indeed. Just as the declaration that there is a "crisis of perestroyka", or a report about Gorbachev's "maneuvering" between the conservatives and liberals.

We heard all this more than once from domestic analysts and read in our own democratic press.

To tell the truth, such evaluations are more rare now: Shifts for the better in the country's political climate can already be seen with the naked eye, and striving for civil accord and consolidation of all sober-minded social forces increasingly manifests itself.

Of course, no one intends to paint an idyllic picture: one can hardly dispute London-based analysts' report about an "outburst" of ethnic problems, economic difficulties, and finally about the interconnection between the "chaos" and "dictatorship" notions (although this is not new either).

IISS Director Francois Heisbourg pessimistically estimated prospects for the development of the Gorbachev-Yeltsin relationship. Well, such an evaluation has the right to exist. But, while recognising "the right to pessimism", one would still expect a closer and more attentive view of the essence of the processes taking place in our society.

The mounting movement towards stabilisation on the basis of radical reforms is the key trend now. This is precisely what determines politicians' relationships.

Meetings between the president of the USSR and republican leaders are held under the watchword of goodwill, the programme of anti-crisis measures is being discussed interestedly, and the drafting of a treaty on a union of sovereign states is in full progress. Such is the "internal political" reality.

Under these conditions, the international component of the Soviet Union's policy of reforms is no less important. Variants of international support for reform processes in the USSR are now being actively worked out.

This is not an easy matter, of course. This is why even the slightest nuances in evaluations are of so much importance and responsibility for the accuracy of forecasts concerning the basic principles of world order is so great.

It is inadmissible to rest content with long outdated stereotypes in this respect.

CPSU Officials Against 'Roundtable' Process

PM2305142191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 May 91 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Valeriy Musatov and Sergey Razuvan, senior CPSU Central Committee International Department officials, in response to reader's letter; first paragraph is reader's letter: "'Roundtables' in East Europe. Is This Experience Applicable in Our Country?"]

[Text] "People in our country have begun to talk of late about a 'roundtable.' People say that representatives of various political parties will attend a 'roundtable' and settle all issues. Then we too will have a government of 'national confidence,' reforms will speed up, stores will be filled with commodities, and there will be fewer criminals. East European experience is cited. I would like to see more detail in PRAVDA about 'roundtables' in general and find out what they have produced and what role they have played."

[signed] A. Dolmatov, Kursk.

The idea of a national "roundtable" that has figured on previous occasions in our rich (unlike the consumer market) political market gained a second wind after the extraordinary Russian congress of people's deputies. It has been most vigorously mooted of late by representatives of "Democratic Russia." The reason being the need to secure via a "roundtable" the social accord that a government based on "national confidence" and other transformed Union organs would convey. A "roundtable" is sometimes associated directly with transferring power to "democratic institutions" modeled on our East European neighbors.

Given the current crisis it seems extremely rash to brush aside from the outset various political suggestions solely

because their authors are considered "unsuitable." But rushing into political experiments indiscriminately at the least threatens to aggravate our problems. The need for garish slogans, self-confident haste, and loud wrangling to give way to unbiased, well-considered analysis of the methods and means of further progress is not so much due as overdue in the seventh year of our liberation from the blinders of dogma, a period in which we have done our utmost to expose historical sores. The main thing is to realize our responsibility for the future of our vast country.

If we use these yardsticks to approach the experience of East European "roundtables" as regards our current anxieties, we are bound to see the main positive element—"roundtable" mechanisms have made it possible to escape from political crises without acute civil conflicts and bloodshed, on principles of peaceful accord. This applies to virtually all of East Europe, although each of these countries had its own special features, needless to say. The champions of the "roundtable" idea in our country generally only single out that aspect of the problem. But serious questions arise if you take a closer look at the specific situation in East Europe, the use to which "roundtable" mechanisms have accordingly been "put," and all the consequences. If the same therapy is used for different diagnoses, the result may be far from desirable, after all. That is precisely the danger in this case.

The practice of "roundtables" was brought about by crisis, waves of which rolled around the countries in our community from mid-1989 through early 1990, when the population's profound dissatisfaction at totalitarian usages that had prevailed for decades spilled over and parties that had individually determined policy lost initiative and support.

Under the avalanche of demonstrations, mass protests, and strikes the old structures of power were either totally paralyzed, as happened in what was the GDR and Czechoslovakia, or began to lose their firm footing, as was the case in Poland and Hungary. What trust could there be in these structures in conditions of a monopolistic one-party system when "unanimously elected" parliaments only served as decoration and the authorities often resisted any change.

The legitimacy, that is, the legality of this authority was always extremely arbitrary and the intensity of the passions necessitated immediate democratic changes: the legalization of opposition, the introduction of a real multiparty system, and the holding of free elections. In countries with experience of reform (Hungary, Poland) these changes followed the path of evolution and agreement, but in those countries where the old authorities blindly persisted, events took an explosive turn. It is worthy of note that economic problems did not play the paramount role. Barring Romania, the economic situation everywhere was relatively good.

The main task for the "roundtables," which were attended on the one hand by the nominally ruling communist parties and on the other by what was generally a united opposition comprising other social forces, was to mold political pluralism and give the opposition legitimacy. Obviously the old governments and parliaments were unable to cope with this task unaided. What is more, the threat of represssive convulsions on their part loomed in a number of countries—something that also brought about the emergence of extraordinary superparliamentary "revolutionary" organs, which is what the "roundtables" became. These "roundtables" adopted decisions regarding changes to constitutions and the adoption of laws, fixed the dates of parliamentary elections, and even directly formed transitional governments.

Is it appropriate, justified, or even, lastly, realistic to resort to this practice in our conditions? We have after all accomplished many tasks in reforming the political system and democratization, at any rate we have gone far beyond the state in which our neighbors used nonconstitutional means to resolve their crises.

Suffice it to cite just a few examples. In Poland, having legalized Solidarity and set a date for elections, the "roundtable" of spring 1989 guaranteed the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] and its allies 65 percent of the seats in the Sejm—the main parliamentary chamber—only allowing political competition full rein in the elections to the new chamber—the Senate. You will agree that these kind of formulas would look prehistoric today in our conditions.

Can you really imagine reproducing in our country variations on the Czechoslovak "roundtable" scenario, where representatives of "Civic Forum" and parties agreed, in particular, to remove and replace some parliamentary deputies without elections and also agreed who would chair the parliament and who would be president of the republic, while the parliament itself submissively "formalized" all this with an open ballot?

When considering the consequences of the "roundtables" as regards securing national accord in Eastern Europe, one cannot help noticing that this linkup only worked in the initial stages when power was moving from one hand to another. Once this process had been accomplished, the accord was noticeably shaky and then became merely a memory. In Hungary, for instance, the agreement to elect the president by universal suffrage, giving the socialists the chance of putting forward their popular candidate I. Pozsgay, was blocked by "yesterday's" opposition as soon as it found itself in power.

Following the parliamentary elections in Poland the PZPR, like a sinking ship, was abandoned by its former allies—the United Peasant and Democratic Parties—and ended up in the minority in the Sejm despite the guaranteed quotas. The future course of events has now been totally determined by Solidarity. After forming its "own" government and leaving former communists for a

brief period at the head of the Defense Ministry and the Ministry of Internal Affairs alone, when the time came it raised and settled the issue of these posts and then the issue of electing its "own" president" in place of W. Jaruzelski, even though his term had by no means expired.

In Czechoslovakia the "national accord" government formed on the basis of the "roundtable" results became virtually a monolith in the space of two months—as a result of practically all the Czechoslovak Communist Party's parliamentary representatives, including the prime minister, leaving its ranks and additional cadre reshuffles.

It has been said that "roundtables" had no and effectively can have no effective mechanisms to monitor the implementation of accords. The upshot was that opportunities for cooperation between the old structures' reformist wing and the new forces were lost. In a number of East European countries the opposition, on coming to power, found itself in a monopoly position without a significant counterbalance, and this facilitated still further its course's drastic swing to the right. In Poland the moderate, judicious Mazowiecki "failed to make it." In Czechoslovakia right-wing circles' intolerance of A. Dubcek and his other "Prague Spring" comrades in arms is growing.

Total political harmony and tolerance has by no means prevailed in East Europe although it has proved possible, as already noted, to avoid worst-case scenarios. The Bulgarian phenomenon, where, even after winning the summer 1990 elections, the Socialists gave up both the presidency and premiership for the sake of social accord in conditions of organized pressure, is extremely significant. But their political rivals do not even seem to like this setup, because the Bulgarian Socialist Party constitutes an influential parliamentary force and a member of the coalition government. The result being the increasing campaign waged by the Union of Democratic Forces for extraordinary elections to be held, obviously in the hope of acquiring dominant positions and full power.

So, the experience of East European "roundtables" is by no means without problems and there are considerable doubts that it would be productive to duplicate it in our political milieu.

Our present conundrums are far more complex; the USSR's historical development has once again taken its own "special" path, and such a multiplicity of interests (not only political but also national) is manifesting itself in our country that it clearly would not be possible to seat all comers around an intimate [kamernyy] "roundtable" or resolve the accumulated questions overnight.

But something else is perhaps the main thing. What do we need with extraordinary, essentially nonconstitutional organs? Who might be bold enough to supplant existing institutions of power and government, and why? Unlike the East European crises, there are democratically elected legislative and executive bodies operating at all levels in our country. Their legitimacy is undisputable from both the legal and political viewpoints. And from the purely practical viewpoint—just try to harm any of our many-faceted sovereignties! Whether the opposition can or cannot extricate the country's economy from the crisis—and that is the most important thing today—is a hypothetical question. After six years of perestroyka it is foolish to, as it were, start "everything from scratch" and disregard the CPSU, which is still an organized and powerful force, the focus of considerable professional and intellectual potential. Confrontation will solve nothing.

It is far more productive not to destroy but to streamline the entire pyramid of structures of power via the Union Treaty, accords between the republics, and a new Constitution, to make the whole mechanism function smoothly from top to bottom, and not upset it. Thank goodness, this realization is setting in.

A unified, multifaceted state does, of course, need conciliation procedures and political consultations. Without them it is inconceivable for the authorities to function normally at all levels, including the president and the Cabinet of Ministers. And what is the Federation Council but a constitutionally legalized and plenipotentiary "roundtable"? Highly important economic, political and cadre decisions do, after all, pass through it. The joint statement issued by the USSR president and the heads of the nine republics represents a giant step toward national civil accord. Obviously, it is in this direction that it is promising to continue the efforts to stabilize the situation in the country and extricate the economy from crisis with the backing of all parties and movements.

At the same time we are bound to acknowledge that the idea of national accord, civil peace, and a "roundtable" as a means of achieving this are not the fruit of speculative fantasy but a recognition of the deadlock of political confrontation. By taking this as the point of departure for dialogue, the actual idea can be given constructive substance and it will then begin to work productively, if, of course, social conditions for it take shape.

The path that "radical democrats" proposed first—the immediate resignation of the president and the Cabinet of Ministers, the dissolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and extraordinary elections—is a destructive one leading the country toward anarchy and chaos. Many people seem to have realized that.

There are also doubts about the idea of abolishing the all-Union presidency and inaugurating a rotating supreme authority within the Federation Council, based on circles close to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic leadership. You only have to look at Yugoslavia with its annual rotation and compare our present crisis with the situation in that country, which has approached the extreme point beyond which disintegration of the unified state can now be glimpsed.

In this connection the course of political centrism proposed by M.S. Gorbachev seems the optimum solution. It stems from uniting broad constructive and patriotic democratic forces. A base for this kind of policy cannot be created without dialogue. It is obviously time to abandon the current idea that the CPSU will not conduct dialogue with anyone. That kind of stance smacks of sectarianism. A series of consultations, open forums, and debates could help the Communist Party above all to restore its ties with the working movement, trade unions, the technical and creative intelligentsia, and other social groups—ties that have been overtaxed of late by political stresses.

Lastly, the question of direct dialogue with forces in opposition to the CPSU. Dialogue is undoubtedly necessary—both in parliaments between factions and groups of various tendencies and on an interparty basis. Ultimately, ideas of dialogue and open debates with all sociopolitical forces are directly enshrined in the decisions adopted by the 28th CPSU Congress. Admittedly, the "democratic bloc" is still acquiring an organizational form, it is heterogeneous. But that does not mean that it does not exist. There is an intellectual elite and an outwardly fairly amorphous base. But one must not forget that it was "amorphous" movements of this kind that emerged victorious from the political struggle in a number of countries in East Europe and only later structuralized themselves. There are enough examples of that in our own country now.

As for the subject of the debates and dialogue, the CPSU and various opposition currents could, in particular, discuss what concrete actions to take to back all-Union and republic anticrisis programs. M.S. Gorbachev, B.N. Yeltsin, and other leaders could discuss why this is contraindicated for representatives of the forces supporting them.

The people have grown tired of verbal battles and indiscriminate attacks amid political controversy. Mutual renunciation of accusations, propaganda outbursts, and improper methods could serve as the precondition for real dialogue between political parties and formations. It also seems to be the time to agree on this.

The "Ten's" approval for the proposal on Union elections was one of the key elements in the accord that has developed among political forces. They may inspire both hope and pessimism. But there is not that much time. It would be an unforgivable mistake were the CPSU, even with its 16.5 million members, to approach a general election on its own, without allies, on East European lines—"alone against everyone." It is obviously time today to lay the foundations of a "democratic center" election coalition, its platform being to extricate the country from the crisis, continue reforms, keep perestroyka within its socialist channel in accordance with existing socioeconomic realities, create a democratic rule-of-law state based on the system of soviets, and safeguard the unity of the country within a renewed federation.

A great deal depends on the normalization processes within the CPSU and its further evolution. The last Central Committee plenum highlighted the acuteness of this problem. Intraparty "roundtables" involving representatives of various currents would not be out of place. We must not avoid considering the alternatives that all political parties experience in today's world. The time of the Bolshevik parties has passed. While ridding ourselves of bureaucratic features and our habitual work methods and losing people, we must ponder what best accords with current conditions—a broad-based cadre party of a predominantly parliamentary type or a party-movement geared to its own political leader.

Drawing conclusions from our neighbors' 1989-1990 political history, we must act and not indulge in self-destructive cultivation of the "enemy image" within our own ranks. There is a far more sensible use for our efforts than to tirelessly exert pressure "across the board" on party politicians with whose names perestroyka itself is associated. European experience shows that communist parties can only expect a fitting political future if they hew to continuity and renewal, increase their reformist potential, and—in our conditions—pool efforts with energetic soviets.

Needless to say, vigorous dialogue is needed with allies and opponents in the spirit of common responsibility to the people. Countersteps must also be taken by centrist forces which are outside the CPSU or have recently left it but have retained their devotion to the socialist idea.

Nonetheless the main thing needed to spark off the process of shaping accord is vigorous actions both in the interests of stabilizing the situation and continuing the reform policy. These actions can be coordinated around a table of any geometric shape. The crux of the matter resides in responsible, substantive consultations within the framework of legal procedures.

The following response to the question as to whether East European "roundtable" experience is applicable seems most suitable: It is instructive and gives us serious food for thought.

Secretariat Views Economic Crime Rise

PM2905152591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[CPSU Central Committee Press Center report: "Against Shadow Economy"]

[Text] A routine session of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat has been held under the chairmanship of V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

It discussed a question which does not leave a single honest person indifferent today—the growing crimes in the economic sphere. The newspapers and television provide many items about the arrest of criminal groups, show piles of assets and money which have been stowed

away or confiscated. The population is forming the entirely specific opinion that there is economic banditry, that the mafia is flourishing, and that no resolute measures can be seen to prevent and halt criminal actions.

What is actually taking place? What is the effectiveness of measures aimed at stepping up the struggle against crimes in the economic sphere? Have the party committees and leaders who are Communists determined their place in the implementation of the USSR president's decree on this issue?

Here is a far from full list of the problems around which an anxious talk is under way. Considering the importance of the question under discussion, Communist chairmen and members of a number of USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions and law enforcement organ leaders were invited to the Secretariat session.

The reports delivered by V.A. Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB, B.K. Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs, and N.S. Trubin, USSR prosecutor general, gave an objective analysis of the state of crime in the economic sphere. There was also a self-critical assessment of the work which is being done to organize the struggle against economic crimes. In particular the following tendency was noted: The dimensions of law violations are increasingly encompassing precisely those spheres of the national economy which are directly linked with satisfying the population's vitally important needs. That applies primarily to enterprises and organizations which store, transport, and sell consumer goods. The drastically increased violations of economic relations and the collapse of the consumer market, the attempts of many local organs to regulate the market by noneconomic methods, the disruption of the shipments and delivery of goods to the retail trade network, and the creation of an artificial shortage are the sources of crimes. Statistics were cited confirming that the growth of speculation in the country has assumed a massive, menacing nature, that there is a sharp increase in the number of law violations in the system of foreign economic activity of cooperative, state, and joint ventures.

Analyzing the unreassuring statistics, CPSU Central Committee Secretary Ye.S. Stroyev rebuked the law enforcement organs—why, given the growth of law violations, does the majority of people committing crimes and conniving with them remain unpunished? In fact the liberalization of criminal punishment for trivial crimes has now been shifted to crimes of a dangerous nature. Last year, for instance, of over 6,000 malicious violators of trade rules only seven were sentenced to imprisonment. It is intolerable, the speaker stressed, when inevitable punishment does not follow dangerous crimes like speculation, major abuses in trade, and embezzlements.

Voicing a number of just remarks with regard to the law enforcement organs, Ye.S. Stroyev called for more resolute action in defense of the Communists working there. After all, he said, it is no secret that on the pretext of depoliticization, autonomy, and independence from the union organs, inconvenient workers are removed from the union organs to be replaced by the organs' "own" workers, who are more obedient in serving ambitious aspirations. And nonetheless the forces of the law enforcement organs are insufficient. Departmental control has been weakened. The growth of thriftlessness is not giving rise to specific resistance from a number of soviet organs. The party committees and all Communists must take a more active part in the struggle against negative phenomena and seek the elimination of their destabilizing influence in society.

CPSU Central Committee Secretary V.M. Falin called the shortage of citizens' personal safety one of the most acute among all our shortages. The rampage of crime has acquired such dimensions that people are constantly anxious for the lives and health of those close to them. This period coincided with the start of perestroyka and some people see it as a consequence of perestroyka. This is a misconception, the speaker stressed, and it could have been avoided if the law enforcement organs had made full use of their potential for preventing crime. That is also borne out by the experience of other countries which have introduced market relations. You only had to familiarize yourself with their legislation and the practice of its application which, in particular, provides in an emergency situation for a quite effective system of measures. As for the protection of the law enforcement organ workers, the party organizations must act more boldly, and not leave unheeded a single instance of encroachment not only on the life and health but also on the honor of those who according to their official duty are defending the USSR Constitution and citizens' rights. The speaker suggested submitting to the USSR Supreme Soviet on behalf of the party the question of stepping up the struggle against crime.

Having noted the legislative organs' blatant lag behind the pass of the transfer of the country's economy to market relations (first came racketeering and only then a law on combatting it), Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom [city committee], dwelled on the reasons for the high level of abuses in cooperatives. There was the largest number of law violations in those cooperatives engaged predominantly in intermediary functions, in the resale of goods. But the taxation system for all types of cooperatives is the same. Meanwhile production cooperatives comprise just six percent of the total.

CPSU Secretaries P.K. Luchinskiy, B.V. Gidaspov, V.A. Kuptsov, and others who took part in the discussion of this question spoke of the slackening of the local party organizations' attention toward participation in the struggle against crime in the economic sphere. It is essential, they stressed to analyze comprehensively in every region the reasons for the growth of economic crime, to give a party-political assessment of the existing state of affairs, and to bring to the broad public our attitude toward the activity of the local organs of soviet power and economic management and their leaders who

do not take specific measures in the struggle against crime in the economy. This work must be actively joined by communist deputies of all levels and by workers' control and other independent associations of working people. It is also important to step up explanatory work in the labor collectives and among the entire population in order to actively influence the formation of public opinion in favor of honest labor, including the opinion of entrepreneurs, and the inadmissibility of using the growth of speculative demand for the profit and enrichment of dishonest people, especially criminal elements.

CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.S. Dzasokhov drew attention to the need for closer cooperation between the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Security Council and other organs of state management and the need for the party line to be pursued more persistently in the law enforcement organs. He suggested that the USSR Security Council and the Cabinet of Ministers be familiarized with the question under examination. The CPSU Central Control Commission, he said, should also launch appropriate work and be more implacable toward those Communists who have come to terms with thriftlessness and abuses.

V.A. Ivashko, who spoke in conclusion, noted that the accelerated adoption of legislative acts aimed at bringing the practice of applying the law into line with the situation existing in the economy has become acutely necessary.

The deputy general secretary expressed himself in favor of every party committee widely publicizing instances of the robbing of our compatriots and of profit gained from the people's misfortunes. Here the participation of workers' control, the people's voluntary militia, and the mass media is important. The primary party organizations should give principled assessments of instances of the merging of the state apparatus with the shadow economy.

As a result of the discussion a resolution was adopted expressing the party approach toward actions aimed at reducing crime in the economic sphere.

The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat also examined several questions of work with the party organizations of Soviet institutions abroad.

The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] proposals on the approval of G.A. Gorbunov as first secretary of the Astrakhan party obkom [oblast committee] and of I.M. Shabanov as first secretary of the Voronezh obkom and the proposal of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee on the approval of V.I. Malev as first secretary of the Zaporozhye party Obkom were adopted.

Humanitarian Aid Distribution Viewed

LD2905185991 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The results of efforts to distribute foreign humanitarian aid to the Soviet Union and Moscow over the past six months were the subject of a news conference at the Moscow City Council (Mossovet) today.

One of the chief results of the efforts is that "we have been shown a very good example of charity", said Viktor Korobchenko, Chairman of the City Committee for humanitarian aid and first deputy chairman of the Mossovet executive.

This example prompted Soviet organisations and individuals to render substantial aid to their needy fellow-citizens, Korobchenko emphasised.

Humanitarian aid from governmental and non-governmental organisations of a number of countries began to reach Mossovet and various Moscow-based organisations on November 29, last year.

In order to organise the reception and distribution of aid, the Mossovet Presidium and the Executive Committee on December 7 set up a City Committee for Humanitarian Aid. Since then more than 7,000 tonnes of cargoes have been handled with the committee's participation. More than 360,000 Muscovites have received food parcels according to lists compiled by people's deputies of Mossovet and district councils.

Humanitarian aid supplies have been delivered to practically all children's medical institutions and boarding schools that are within the systems of public education and social maintenance.

The largest number of individual parcels came from Austria—about 140,000, from the German religious charity organisation Karitas—more than 165,000, and a large number of parcels came from Holland, France, Switzerland, and Belgium.

Within the framework of humanitarian aid, Moscow received a large amount of medicines and medical equipment that were handed over to Moscow-based health care institutions. They received about 360 tonnes of charity cargoes from Japan, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, France, Belgium, the United States, Italy, and Poland.

In addition, under an intergovernmental agreement, Germany supplied more than 100,000 tonnes of food to Moscow for sale through the state-run trading network. The deliveries made it possible to considerably extend the range of foodstuffs on sale in city shops.

Soviet military pilots and servicemen of the Moscow military district rendered much assistance in the delivery of humanitarian aid cargoes to Moscow, Korobchenko stressed.

The committee has available information on planned delivery of humanitarian aid from Japan, and intergovernmental talks are under way with the European Community on the supply of a large amount of food to Moscow and other regions of the USSR, Korobchenko said.

TASS Reviews Press for 30 May

LD3005070991 Moscow TASS in English 0651 GMT 30 May 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Today's newspapers highlight President Mikhail Gorbachev's tour of Kazakhstan.

On Wednesday, Gorbachev met farmers in Chimkent region, newspapers report.

Several newspapers cover the presidential race in Russia. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and PRAVDA write about Boris Yeltsin's tour of Karelia and Amangeldiy Tuleyev's visit to the Soviet Far East.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries Nikolay Ryzhkov's answers to voters' questions.

The former Soviet prime minister, running for the presidency of the largest Soviet republic, said he disagrees with the new anti-crisis programme supported by Yeltsin and Gorbachev.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN covers Ryzhkov's visit to Krasnoyarsk.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries an interview with Democratic Liberal Party leader Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, who is also running for the post.

Zhirinovskiy called for an end to the confrontation between Russian and central authorities, warning of chaos if the Union disintegrates.

He also called for stronger and more active Armed Forces.

Boris Yeltsin is more popular than other contenders, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA writes, citing the results of a telephone opinion poll.

Ryzhkov's popularity is on the rise in Tyumen region, it reports, quoting the data by Tyumen University.

The Soviet parliament on Wednesday passed the first reading of a bill on foreign investment, which grants foreign investors new powers and contains guarantees to protect foreign investment.

"Foreign investment could play an important role in modernising and restructuring Soviet economy, especially in the sphere of demilitarisation," Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov told the legislature.

TRUD writes about the first steps of the Ritm joint stock society.

PRAVDA carries a story about Gennadiy Gromov, the designer who developed the radio-technical landing system for the Soviet Buran space shuttle.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA comments on the outcome of the first international congress recently held in Andrey Sakharov's memory in Moscow.

The newspaper reviews Soviet foreign policy during perestroyka, describing it as "a denunciation of the global achievements of Soviet power during the 70 years of its existence."

The newspaper praised Gorbachev and former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze who "turned the defeat of the Soviet empire in the international arena" into "the victory of new Soviet political thinking."

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publishes an article by American publicist Michael Davidow about the new economic recovery plan prepared by Grigoriy Yavlinskiy.

The United States supports the new "Marshall Plan" because it aims to dismantle the socialist system and move the country to capitalism, he writes.

Economic

Foreign Investment Bill Passes 1st Reading

OW3005030091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 29 May 91

[From "Business Today"]

[Text] The federal parliament in Moscow has adopted in its first reading, a bill on foreign investment allowing foreign investors to set up businesses in the Soviet Union as well as granting long-term concessions to foreign companies.

The Soviet prime minister, Mr Valentin Pavlov, presenting the bill said it was creating a requisite legal groundwork for the protection of foreign investments. He also said independent experts, both local and foreign, as well as Western entrepreneurs were involved in preparing the paper.

Mr Pavlov raised certainty that the new law would help attract foreign investment into the Soviet economy to overcome the country's crisis.

He stressed the attraction of foreign investments must be linked with privatization of state-owned enterprises. "Foreign investors can and must be involved in privatization on a par with their Soviet counterparts," said Mr Pavlov.

The chairman of the international affairs comittee of the Russian parliament, Mr Vladimir Lukin, said the center's proposed legislation on foreign investments was

setting "good grounds for cooperation with republican laws". (A number of republics, including the Russian Federation, had started discussing their own foreign investment bills much ahead of the federal parliament. The Russian parliament is already registering foreign businesses in the republic).

Mr Pavlov called for setting up a joint body run by the center and the republics to coordinate Western foreign investments in the Soviet Union.

Benefits To Be Increased From Higher Revenue

PM2305153191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "On Social Protection"]

[Text] The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has adopted a resolution "On Additional Measures To Provide the Population with Social Protection in Connection With the Reform of Retail Prices."

It says that the USSR and republic agreement on questions relating to the reform of retail prices and social protection for the population envisages pursuing a common, coordinated policy in the sphere of pricing and incomes.

At the same time the leadership of the republics and local organs of power have decided to raise retail prices and tariffs for individual types of municipal and consumer services, along with a number of consumer goods whose prices are set by republic and local organs of management, for which the agreement did not make provision.

Under these conditions the USSR Government deems it advisable to channel incomes obtained from the above rise in prices and tariffs into increasing compensation payments to the population.

With a view to increasing social protection for the population the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has adopted a resolution which envisages increasing minimum compensation payments to workers employed in underground and open-cut mining work in [as published] metallurgical and other sectors of the national economy.

Enterprises, associations, and organizations have been accorded the right, as of the second quarter of 1991, to increase the baseline level of funds for consumption, on the basis of 400 rubles [R] per month for one worker, to be funded from profits remaining at their disposal, and to increase the baseline level of additional compensation payments in excess of the guaranteed minimum, provided that there is a corresponding increase in sales of consumer goods and paid services to the population.

It is recommended that enterprises, associations, and organizations, along with increasing wages, direct additional funds into consumption and increased payments linked with social and labor concessions, including compensation for the increase in the cost of food in canteens, refreshment bars, and clinics, as well as children's sanatoriums, creches, and Pioneer and convalescent camps.

USSR ministries and enterprises, associations, and departments are tasked with concluding agreements with the relevant sector trade union associations and trade union committees on measures to ensure the phased increase of labor remuneration as of the second half of 1991, incorporating compensation payments into wage rates and official salaries, and measures to expand social and labor concessions.

It is recommended that enterprises make more extensive use of their rights to pay monthly compensation to women on leave looking after children aged 18 months to three years from profits remaining at their disposal. Funds spent for these purposes are not counted when determining the amount of money for consumption.

It is deemed advisable to organize individual calculation of working citizens' mandatory insurance contributions to the pension fund with a view to increasing the size of their pensions from the money contributed.

It is recommended that republic governments offer invalids' public formations financial support in the form of budget subsidies and tax concessions.

By agreement with Union republic governments, it is laid down that personnel of enterprises, organizations, and establishments are to be reimbursed R25 per day for additional expenditure incurred in duty tours to Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Tashkent, Alma-Ata, Tbilisi, Baku, Vilnius, Kishinev, Riga, Bishkek, Dushanbe, Yerevan, Ashkhabad, and Tallinn and R20 for trips to other cities and population centers, these payments to be made without the need for documentation to confirm the expenditure incurred.

It is recommended that republic governments examine the question of paying compensation to personnel of culture and education and nonschool mass sports establishments owned or used by trade unions, with the intention of making these payments to sections not covered by trade union funds, from budgetary funds or other sources.

The resolution also makes provision for certain other measures.

'Still Nothing To Buy' Despite 2 Apr Price Hike

PM2405132191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Ye. Sorokin report: "Still Nothing To Sell"]

[Text] The further we get from that fateful day for consumers, 2 April, the clearer it becomes that raising prices was pointless as far as commodity producers are concerned. They certainly have not rushed to boost their output.

The volume of retail trade in April was equivalent to 62.7 percent of last April's total in comparable prices. It is true, however, that demand for bread, bakery goods, and pasta has stabilized. But that, perhaps, is all. Food stores still do not have a wealth of goods on offer. There are shortages of cereals, meat, butter, cheese, tea—practically everything.

Is there any point in expecting foodstuffs if all the republics are engaged in their own brand of "socialist competition"—to see who can supply the least? For example, livestock purchases in the Ukraine have fallen by 11 percent in comparison with last year in live weight terms; and the supply of livestock for the population has dropped by 24 percent. The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of Agriculture and Food predicts that livestock and poultry purchases will be reduced by 18 percent in the second quarter of this year compared with last year, while the purchase of some dairy products will fall by 7 to 17 percent.

The population is rapidly becoming converted to Alaska pollock: There has been a sharp increase in the demand for fish, particularly that fish, the cheapest. On the other hand, there will soon be nothing to wash the fish down with: Tea production has fallen by 18 percent.

The sharp increase in the cost of light industrial goods has also failed to produce abundant supplies. People have begun to buy less children's outerwear and footwear, fur hats, real silk dresses, and so forth, of course.

Moreover, even the production of items that people might feel embarrassed to wear is falling. In April, output of leather footwear dropped by 13 to 15 percent; of knitwear and hosiery by 16 to 18 percent; and of textiles by 11 to 13 percent. The situation in some oblasts and republics is even worse. For example, in April enterprises in Voronezh Oblast reduced their output of sewn goods and knitwear by 27 percent and of leather footwear by 39 percent.

The country is short of literally everything: Refrigerators, irons, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, furniture, and television sets. In most villages and cities, people do not even lay eyes on these goods.

Frightened by the sharp increase in popular discontent, local authorities everywhere are now reducing the cost of meals in the public catering system or are paying compensation. The practice of providing cheaper school meals has become extremely widespread. Finding the funds for this has been given top priority. In most republics and oblasts in the RSFSR, local funds have been used to reduce the cost of school meals by 30 to 75 percent; in Belorussia, the cost of school meals has fallen by 30 to 70 percent in all of the republic's oblasts; and all primary class students in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Moldova, and Turkmenistan now receive free meals. Moreover, Uzbekistan has found it possible to partially compensate senior students as well. This problem has been resolved in a similar way in Kazakhstan, and this work has been partially implemented in other regions of the country.

In more and more regions of the country, students at higher education establishments and technical schools are being compensated for their meals. This problem has been completely solved in Belorussia, and the appropriate decisions have been adopted in Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Latvia.

At the same time, this problem is being resolved only slowly in a number of regions. Most oblasts in the Ukraine, Armenia, and Azerbaijan have not found it possible to compensate students for the cost of their meals. In the RSFSR, students in only 40 percent of all higher education establishments (200 out of 500) receive meal subsidies equivalent to 30 to 50 percent of the value of their food allowance.

In accordance with USSR Cabinet of Ministers Resolution No. 146 of 6 April 1991, the USSR Ministry of Finance, the USSR State Committee for Public Education, and the USSR Ministry of Trade have drawn up a procedure for partially compensating students at schools, vocational and technical schools, special secondary schools, and higher education establishments for the increased cost of public catering.

A typical feature in many regions is the substantial drop in public catering enterprises' sale of meals and of goods made from meat and meat products, with the structure of consumption shifting in favor of increased demand for goods made from cereals, pasta, flour, vegetables, potato, milk, and dairy products.

As we can see, life has not improved under the new prices. There was nothing to buy before—and there is still nothing to buy now.

'Useless' Government Economic Program Criticized

PM2405144591 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 17, 28 Apr 91 p 1

[Commentary under "MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI Exclusive" rubric compiled from "opinion" of economists Yegor Gaydar, Nikolay Petrakov, Vladimir Tikhonov, Nikolay Shmelev, and Grigoriy Yavlinskiy: "Enigmatic Program"]

[Text] According to TASS reports, as a result of a discussion of the government's anticrisis program at a series of conferences with Premier Valentin Pavlov, the "basic provisions of the draft program as a whole were supported" and were given "a positive assessment on the whole." This astonished many people because the meetings included economists who have criticized the government's activity a number of times. Consequently, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI asked Yegor Gaydar, Nikolay Petrakov, Vladimir Tikhonov, Nikolay

Shmelev, and Grigoriy Yavlinskiy to comment on those meetings. Here is their opinion.

Both at the conference between the head of the cabinet and economists and at his meeting with leaders of industrial and enterprise unions, the cabinet's program was firmly criticized. No one gave it "a positive assessment on the whole" or "approved its basic provisions." Furthermore, it is difficult to talk about any program here; it is appropriate to talk only about a list of declarations.

It is a different matter that the materials presented may be regarded as a reflection of the government's pro-market intentions. But some of the proclaimed measures may be interpreted as demonstrating a desire to support, for example, the development of enterprise.

Unfortunately, the government's present rating is such that its program—even regardless of its quality—cannot inspire confidence. Furthermore, it is utterly without specific content and its implementation is unclear, as is the way in which the republics' agreement will be achieved. In particular, it does not answer the question of precisely how the viability of the ruble will be restored, how finances will be improved, and how the problem of the budget will be settled—without which all other steps are pointless. In brief, it does not take into account the dramatic situation in which the economy now finds itself.

The question then is this: Why is this program needed at all? As a political document it is useless since society will not accept it because of its "authorship," and as an economic document it is imprecise. Clearly, it is simply that the government decided to answer the accusation that it lacked an action program as well as to give an assurance of its "market" course to those international financial circles worried by certain statements by the head of the cabinet.

Innovative Enterprises Association Established

LD2905104591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2330 GMT 28 May 91

[Text] An Association of Small Innovative Enterprises has been set up in Moscow under the aegis of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology.

The transition to market relations is giving birth to new forms of organization of work in science and technology. Technical parks [tekhparki] and technopolises [tekhnopolisy] and innovative structures are arising.

However, so far nobody has coordinated their activity. This is what the Association will be engaged in. The introduction of progressive scientific ideas and technical developments, the development of enterprise, the creation of conditions for scientific activity—these are the tasks of the new organization.

Agriculture

Senko on Cabinet's Agro-Industrial Policy

PM2905155691 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[A. Gamov report on 21 May news conference by USSR Deputy Prime Minister F.P. Senko—place not given: "Attention and Concern for the Countryside"]

[Text] What steps is the USSR Cabinet of Ministers taking to stabilize the situation in the agro-industrial complex and meet the population's requirements for food products? These matters were the subject of a news conference held on 21 May by USSR Deputy Prime Minister F.P. Senko.

It was noted that in the first four months of this year, the volume of food produced in the country as a whole fell by 7 percent. This is due first and foremost to the disruption of established economic ties between enterprises in the stage of transition to market relations, and to last year's difficult weather conditions when, because of prolonged rain, the necessary quantity of coarse and succulent feed could not be procured, leading to a decline in the productivity of animals. Mistakes were made in providing incentives for the procurement of grain destined for state resources, and this had an adverse effect on the centralized provision of mixed feeds for poultry farms, livestock complexes, and large livestock units.

As the deputy prime minister reported, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of Union republics have drawn up a series of measures aimed at overcoming the adverse trends that have emerged in the agro-industrial complex. In accordance with the anti-crisis program, it is proposed to improve the provision of material and technical resources here. Work is being done to attract foreign investments, first and foremost for the production of machines and equipment and the introduction of progressive technologies. Great attention is being devoted to improving production relations, and in particular to the creation of small leaseholding collectives and cooperatives within kolkhozes and sovkhozes, as well as peasant farms, of which there are 55,000 as of today. Targeted programs for the social development of the countryside have been drawn up. These and other measures will make it possible to boost the peasants' interest in the results of their labor and strengthen the agricultural economy.

In connection with the fact that there have been increasingly frequent instances in the Russian Federation of forcible implementation of the land reform being carried out by the Russian parliament and government, that the seizure and distribution of the state land reserve has begun, and that attempts are being made to break up kolkhozes and sovkhozes, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's correspondent asked the deputy prime minister responsible for the agro-industrial complex to explain how the new Cabinet of Ministers reacts to such cases.

"There have indeed been cases where, in places, people try to forcibly confiscate from kolkhozes and sovkhozes land that belongs to them, which is contrary to the legislation of the USSR and Union republics," F.P. Senko said. "Order is now being imposed in resolving these qeustions. As for the intention to eliminate kolkhozes and sovkhozes, I think this is mistaken. In the immediate future, kolkhozes and sovkhozes will continue to be the country's main food producers."

Mid-May Weather, Crop Status Reported

PM2805102791 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 25 May 91 p 2

[Agrometeorologist S. Malikova report: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] In most of the USSR's European part stem growth in winter crops has continued, and they have tillered in the north of the territory. In the extreme south of the territory wheat and barley have started to ear, and rye has eared in the Ukraine, the south of Central-Chernozem Region, and the Lower Volga. Shoots have appeared in early spring grain crops south of the line linking Tallinn, Smolensk, Ivanovo, Kirov, and Sverdlovsk. They have tillered in Belorussia, the Central Chernozem Region, and the south of the Central Region, and stem growth in spring barley has continued in the more southerly rayons. Shoots of corn have appeared in the territory's southern rayons, and the start of leaf formation has been noted in early sown fields.

Potato shoots have appeared in south Ukraine. The limit of apple orchard blossoming has advanced northward approximately to a line passing through Riga, Smolensk, Ryazan, and Izhevsk. The cherry blossom limit passes somewhat more to the north: through Pskov, Vladimir, and Yoshkar-Ola. In the south of the territory orchard blossoming has finished and fruit growth on the plants is under way. The formation of flower clusters on vines has continued in vineyards. Because of cold weather with frosts at the start of the 10-day period, conditions for fruit crops' florescence were unfavorable.

Warmer weather than usual predominated in West Siberia's agricultural rayons and Kazakhstan's northern agricultural oblasts. Stem growth began in winter crops.

In East Siberia's agricultural rayons rains—with snow in places—complicated the carrying out of field work and the sowing of early summer grain crops during a period of two to four days. In most of the Far East's territory conditions for carrying out field work and sowing thermophilic crops were favorable.

In the Central Asian republics cool, rainy weather predominated, a number of rayons having hail and squally wind. The mean air temperature for the 10-day period was two to three degrees lower than the longstanding average. Conditions for the cotton plant's growth and development were unfavorable. In most of the territory the development of its third leaf is being noted, and the fifth leaf has appeared in early crops. Winter wheat and barley have eared and flowered, the swelling of their grain has proceeded in Turkmenia, and stem growth was coming to an end in south Kazakhstan and Kirghizia. The height of winter wheat varied from 60 to 100 cm. Strong downpours caused lodging of tall crops and created unfavorable conditions for plant florescence. The formation and growth of fruits in fruit crops has continued, and the mass florescence of vines proceeded.

Scientific

MVD Denies 'Harmful Substances' Discharged

PM2905222591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 91 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report under "Tickertape" rubric: "Do Not Believe the Rumors"]

[Text] The standby service of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and the editorial offices of Central Television and newspapers received many telephone calls 29 May in connection with reports that a discharge of some kind of harmful substances into the atmosphere had allegedly occurred in the area of Stupino city in Moscow Oblast. According to a statement issued at the USSR MVD press center, the alarm is unfounded.

According to information available to the press center, a civil defense exercise to rehearse fire-fighting techniques was carried out 29 May at an enterprise in the Moscow Oblast city of Krasnogorsk. The exercise has ended, and the enterprise management is analyzing its results.

A TASS correspondent has contacted the USSR Cabinet of Ministers State Commission for Emergency Situations, which has also received many telephone calls to the effect that explosions accompanied by a discharge of radioactive substances had taken place in various cities of Moscow Oblast 29 May.

According to the commission, no major industrial accidents or disasters have occurred in Moscow Oblast recently. Rumors about heightened radiation allegedly emanating from the Obninsk nuclear power station are also conjectures. The Civil Defense headquarters reports that there has been no accident at the Obninsk nuclear power station.

Voronezh Nuclear Power Station Declared Safe

PM3005084491 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report from IZVESTIYA, RIA, TASS, POSTFACTUM, REUTER roundup: "IAEA Mission to Novo-Voronezhskiy Nuclear Power Station"]

[Text] The IAEA mission which has checked the operational safety of the third and fourth power units at the Novo-Voronezhskiy nuclear electric power station confirmed their high degree of reliability. In the opinion of

Bernard Thomas, leader of the group of experts, the number of insignificant so-called "incidents" at the two first-generation reactors that have worked for a total of 40 reactor-years was the lowest in comparison with similar installations in Europe. Moreover, none of the "incidents" went beyond the production area and all were rated at the lowest point on the international scale, IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Mirolevich reported.

Launch of 'Progress M-8' Cargo Ship

LD3005105191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1031 GMT 30 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 May (TASS)—At 1104 today the automatic cargo ship "Progress M-8" was launched in the Soviet Union in accordance with the program for further work at the "Mir" science-research complex.

The aim of the launch of the ship is to deliver expendable materials and various freight to the "Mir" piloted complex.

The "Progress M-8" ship has been put into orbit with the following parameters:

— Maximum distance from the earth surface—249 kilometers;

— Minimum distance from the earth surface—191 kilometers;

— Period of revolution—88.6 minutes;

— Inclination - 51.6 degrees.

According to telemetry data, onboard systems of the automatic cargo ship are working normally.

Soyuz TM-12 Spaceship Undocks From Mir Complex

LD2805202691 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT 28 May 91

[By unidentified TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Cosmonauts Anatoliy Artsebarskiy and Sergey Krikalev today undocked the spaceship Soyuz TM-12 from the transfer module of the Mir orbital station and linked it to the astrophysical module Kvant, an operation envisaged by the flight programme.

The reorientation of the orbital complex will facilitate future transport operations, including refuelling and delivering equipment and other cargoes by unmanned craft named Progress.

Before today's operation, the commander and the flight engineer entered the transport ship and sealed the trapdoors. At 13:10 Moscow time the two spacecraft undocked. The cosmonauts manually controlled the flight of the orbital complex, approaching and docking procedures.

They also examined and photographed the basic unit and modules.

The Soyuz TM-12 spacecraft stayed away from the station for 42 minutes.

The cosmonauts continue to work on board the space research complex Mir. Both are feeling well.

Docking Earns Soyuz Commander 'Highest Praise'

LD2305120391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 20 May 91

[Report by P. Orlov from the flight control center—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The event that happened today and supplanted others, of which there are quite a few on the first working day of the week, is of course the successful docking in space orbit of the Mir station and the Soyuz TM transport craft. Over to the flight control center.

[Orlov] Allow me to point out that the opinion that, with the adoption of the entry and exit law, everyone will leave our country does not look absolutely correct viewed from the flight control center. I know at least one place in our country where people gladly come to live and work. It is the Mir station.

And that despite the fact that today's docking, today's approach of the craft to the station was not exactly straightforward. Anatoliy Artsebarskiy, commander of the TM-12, manually steered his craft with Sergey Krikalev and Helen Sharman on board toward the station and docked. Take a look at the screen: The figures are frozen and the cosmonaut is steering the craft, just like a car, by eye. Among themselves, cosmonauts call this "hands-on experience." But that is in jest, in jest when everything has ended well. Just like today.

Anatoliy Artsebarskiy has earned the highest praise from the flight control center for his work.

This is already the second time that Sergey Krikalev has relieved Musa Manarov in orbit. Viktor Afanasyev has six months in orbit behind him. I have already spoken about Anatoliy Artsebarskiy. He did an excellent job today, and he is now familiarizing himself with the station. And now to the impressions of the British cosmonaut-researcher Helen Sharman.

[Helen Sharman, to camera, speaking in Russian] Now I see what a big house we have. There is a great deal of work here to be done. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to be here.

[Orlov] The main task in Helen Sharman's work in orbit is space biology.

Incidentally, in a couple of days another spacecraft will go into orbit—the U.S. shuttle Columbia. It also has a biological research program on board. Incidentally—and this is a coincidence—it will have three women on board

in a crew of seven. But it can hardly be a coincidence that two major space centers—the Soviet and the American—are studying biological specimens in orbit so closely.

The Americans are saying frankly that orbital stations, long-term orbital stations are the future of space science, the future of our whole planet. We talk about this in more modest tones, despite the fact that we have such an orbital station. But that is the future. As for the present, as for our reality, it has made its impression here too, in the flight control center. Unfortunately Helen Sharman's parents were unable to watch these pictures here in the flight control center. Concerned about the air traffic controllers' strike in our country, they were forced to leave for home.

This does not prevent us, however, from wishing the Soviet-British crew success in their work.

Functions of Almaz Space Complex Described

LD2505174191

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1615 GMT on 23 May broadcasts a video report from the Mashinostroyeniye research and production association in Reutovo, near Moscow. The report deals with the Almaz unmanned space complex which is being developed at the research association.

The program begins with an interview with Gerbert Aleksandrovich Fremov, captioned as general designer of the Mashinostroyeniye research and production association, seated in his office. Speaking about his organization, Fremov says:

"This is a defense enterprise. Therefore, until recently we could not meet you as openly as now. And this is our debut in the 'Man, the Earth, and the Universe' program. As far as space equipment is concerned, the main field of our interest is heavy orbital automatic stations with comprehensive possibilities, which are capable of carrying a great weight of research and practical equipment necessary for solving tasks and obtaining information from space." Fremov goes on to speak about the history of the association and the importance of the space information it obtains for agriculture, natural resources, and global environmental problems.

The interview with Fremov is followed by a shot of a large room with a mock-up of the "Almaz" unmanned complex. Igor Yuryevich Postnikov, captioned as the chief leading designer, tells viewers about the wonders of the "Almaz" complex: "We are in the room of the trial complex of the Mashinostroyeniye research and production association. You are facing a mock-up of the "Almaz" spacecraft. A special feature of this spacecraft is that it has the first home produced high definition radar on board. This radar will permit observations of the earth's surface from a height of 300 km. And we can see from space objects as small as 20-30 meters." He goes on to say: "The Almaz is also equipped with a television system and a number of instruments for research, including for the Moscow State University Nuclear Physics Research Institute."

Vladimir Vasilyevich Viter, captioned as deputy general designer of the Mashinostroyeniye research and production association, then speaks about the launch of the Almaz into space, which took place on 31 March. The first films arrived on 24 April, he says. The video shows stills of the earth's surface in the Moscow area, in northern Italy, and west Germany, and their geological structures. Viter explains the agricultural importance of various areas. The Almaz can lift great weights and communications with it are good, he says in conclusion, adding that the station will be further equipped to carry out research into environmental problems.

Military

CPSU's Surkov Visits Leningrad Troops

PM2805113091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Lieutenant Colonel A. Vlades report: "Visiting the Troops"]

[Text] Lieutenant General M.S. Surkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the USSR Armed Forces CPSU organization's party committee, spent six days in the Northern Fleet and the Leningrad Military District.

During meetings with Communists, the party aktiv, leadership personnel, and military journalists, there was an open and principled discussion of the priority tasks of Armed Forces party organizations arising from the situation that has developed in society and the party. They discussed questions of stabilizing the situation in primary party organizations and forming, through these organizations, a healthy ideological and moral atmosphere in troop collectives and a profound understanding among personnel of the CPSU's policy, particularly in the spheres of military building and people's social and legal protection. In conjunction with the party aktiv an analysis of trends in the life of party organizations was carried out, and their practical actions to implement the decisions of the first all-Army party conference were formulated in detail. The secretary of the all-Army party committee devoted considerable attention to experience in renewing and strengthening party ranks, improving the theoretical and professional training of Communists, and bringing its content, forms, and methods into line with present-day demands.

A meeting with seamen's mothers was held in Kronstadt, at which social protection for servicemen was discussed.

Conversion of Military Production Described

LD3005052391 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Now an interview with Yuriy Matsak, deputy chairman of the state military industrial commission. He describes how the program of reducing the production of weapons and military hardware is carried out in the Soviet Union.

[Matsak is heard briefly, fading into English translation] At the beginning, says Yuriy Matsak, we planned to reduce supplies of weapons and military hardware for the Army in 1991 by 19.5 percent as compared with 1988 levels. In reality, it's turned out to be much bigger. It will be about a 28 percent reduction. In 1988 we had five factories turning out tanks; now there are only three, and the question is whether to leave only two, says Yuriy Matsak.

I'd only like to add that such a cut is only one element of the program of converting the arms manufacturing industry which is now being implemented in the Soviet Union. There are a mass of difficulties of course—financial, material, technological, social, and even psychological. And this is not surprising. Reorientating whole industries is a painful process for any economy, and the more so for one hit by a crisis. Nevertheless, things do seem to be moving, at least by what Yuriy Matsak has told us.

Two years ago the whole of the light, food, textile, and a bigger part of the medical industry, including the orthapedic one, were handed over to the defense complex. And we have already some rather good results. For instance, according to statistics, up to 1 May we turned out more than 12 million disposable syringes a day, and that is only one of the fields of medicine, says Yuriy Matsak.

Besides, the converted arms manufacturing industry produces millions of TV sets a year, refrigerators, machines, and other commodities which are today in short supply in the Soviet Union. What's more, there are very many cases when the machinery and equipment became dozens of times more productive, and this is because advanced and up till now classified technologies and materials of the arms manufacturers have been passed over to the civilian industries.

Over 400 Arms Plants Involved in Conversion

LD2905111991 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] An international conference on the problems of conversion is being held in Kiev, the Ukrainian capital. Taking part are specialists from Britain, Canada, and the United States. Together with their Soviet counterparts, they are discussing ways of stepping up conversion. In the Soviet Union, over 400 arms manufacturing plants are involved in the process of conversion. Today already half of their output is civilian goods. Among other things, they turn out household appliances, farm machinery, and medical instruments. Now that there are less military contracts, the arms manufacturing plants begin to look more actively for more ways of using their capacities; for instance, a shipyard on the White Sea which used to build nuclear submarines will be now making submarines for tourists.

Internationalist Soldiers Forum Issues Appeal

PM2805103991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 May 91 First Edition p 1

["Appeal of Participants in the First All-Army Conference of Internationalist Servicemen to USSR Armed Forces Personnel"]

[Text] Dear comrades, friends- and comrades-in-arms, we appeal to you on behalf of the large detachment of USSR Armed Forces servicemen who have performed their internationalist duty outside our motherland.

In stern testing times, far from our fatherland, we learned to value fraternity-in-arms, to cherish the warmth of the hearth and home, and to love our native land even more strongly. We, the sons of the multinational family of the Soviet people, have learned through our own experience the great strength of international friendship, unity, and Army fraternity.

We appeal to you at a difficult time for our fatherland. The economic crisis is worsening. Social tension is intensifying. Our brothers-in-arms who jointly shed their blood on the soil of Afghanistan increasingly find themselves on different sides of the barricades amidst political confrontation and interethnic conflicts. Sometimes those who shared their last crust of bread, last gulp of water, and last round of ammunition now oppose one another.

In our state's difficult domestic conditions the Army remains a reliable guarantee of the indissolubility of the USSR, an earnest of civil accord and peace, and a bulwark of safe social development. In clear awareness of this, we call upon you, our friends-in-arms, not to yield to the appeals of belligerent political intriguers and extremists and to strengthen friendship and troop comradeship, resist attempts to wreck our state, and honestly and selflessly perform your constitutional duty.

It is more important than ever today to clearly define your position in the events taking place. This applies first and foremost to officers and warrant officers, who form the backbone of our Army. Remember that our political maturity and active life stance are often determinative in shaping subordinates' views.

We declare the need to remain loyal to socialist ideals which, despite all the mistakes and distortions of the recent past, have been and remain a true guideline for our society. Each of us has seen through his own experience that the successful performance of our constitutional duty requires not just courage and patriotism, but

also a high standard of martial skill, organization, discipline, professionalism, and sound physical conditioning. Mindful of this, we appeal to all servicemen who have taken part in providing internationalist aid: Our experience of combat and life should become the property of today's defenders of the motherland and find wide application in the everyday practice of training and educating servicemen and preparing young people for military service.

We urge all of you to provide constant moral and material succor and support to the disabled of the Great Patriotic War, to internationalist servicemen, and to the families of the deceased and to take burial places and memorials under your wing.

We express our gratitude for the initiative of party organizations of military units and ships in creating in the All-Army Party Committee a fund to provide material assistance to internationalist servicemen out of funds transferred by the former.

We approve and support the accord reached by the USSR Defense Ministry with various public organizations in the country to hold an All-Army Unifying Conference of Internationalist Servicemen, which will serve the noble cause of consolidating healthy forces in the fight to preserve the USSR, strengthen the unity of the Army and the people, and enhance young people's patriotic and international education.

Ensuring the reliable defense of our country and its territorial integrity is our paramount task, and internationalist servicemen are ready to devote all their experience of life and combat to its successful implementation. We urge all Armed Forces personnel to improve in every way the level of combat readiness of formations and units, to tighten military discipline, and to vigilantly and reliably protect the Soviet people's peaceful labor.

Internationalist Forum News Conference Held

PM2405115691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report from "Latest News" column: "Results of the First All-Army Conference"]

[Text] A press conference of internationalist servicemen was held at the Central House of the Soviet Army yesterday. Journalists were addressed by Army General V. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and deputy defense minister, and Lieutenant General I. Mikulin, chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate. It was stressed that the main aim was achieved—to pool the efforts of movements of internationalist servicemen, to improve the military-patriotic education of young people, and to ensure the social protection of internationalists. Let us remind you that the 726 delegates represented more than 67,000 internationalist servicemen.

'Internationalist Servicemen' Movement Explained

LD2305161791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Networks in Russian 1200 GMT 23 May 91

[From the "Armed Forces and Society" program produced by the Radio and Television Creative Production Association RADAR]

[Excerpt] [Rusinov] The RADAR Studio: Armed Forces and Society program is on the air. Your journalist, Captain 2d Class Vyacheslav Rusinov is at the microphone.

The first all-Army conference of internationalist servicemen has ended its work in Moscow. Our correspondent Tatyana Chemodanova talks to Colonel General Nikolay Ivanovich Shlyaga, chief of the Main Military-Political Directorate of the USSR Armed Forces about the basic aim of such a roundtable and the role which has been taken on by the Defense Ministry in rallying the movement of internationalist servicemen.

[Begin recording] [Shlyaga] The aim of the conference is to unite all public associations, organizations, and associations of the union of internationalist servicemen inasmuch as they are acting apart, and sometimes duplicate one another. At present there are over 400 independent organizations in the country. The main aim is to unite the movement of internationalist servicemen into a single movement. But in no way is the question being posed of introducing a split in the veterans movements in the country as a whole, which includes the Council of War and Labor Veterans, the Committee of War Veterans of the Armed Forces, and Internationalist Servicemen. This is the main aim which is being set.

[Chemodanova] And Army and Navy collectives will most probably be helping in this?

[Shlyaga] We find it gratifying that it is precisely internationalist servicemen are doing their regular military service in the USSR Armed Forces who are the initiators of this. They were the initiators and their proposals have been supported by the defense minister and the Main Military-Political Directorate, and we will realize this idea.

[Chemodanova] Negative aspects of the attitude toward the Afghans [veterans of Afghan conflict] are from time to time slipping into the press. Do you have such aspects? And how do you react to them?

[Shlyaga] There are quite a few such examples. The Defense Ministry and the Main Military-Political Directorate are reacting to such things. We are appealing both to the press and to the corresponding ministries and departments—this is simply impermissible inasmuch as the results of the Afghan war are being revised. People went through the crucible of war and fulfilled their sacred duty to the end, and they do not deserve this. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Smirnov Views Role of 'Soldier-Internationalist'

LD2105121991 Moscow TASS in English 0929 GMT 21 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS—Some 50,000 Soviet servicemen were staying with an internationalist mission in various countries over the past 40 odd years. Colonel-General Yevgeniy Smirnov, deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, said this in an interview with the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, published today.

He said that quite often best representatives of the commanding and political departments and of engineers and technicians of the Army and Navy were sent to work abroad and quite often to participate in combat operations.

From June 1950 to the present, Soviet servicemen, including advisers, specialists and translators were staying in North Korea, Algeria, Egypt, Vietnam, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Afghanistan and some other countries.

Soviet servicemen who performed internationalist duty in these countries have the juridical status of soldier-internationalist, Smirnov said.

Many of Soviet military advisers and specialists performed their internationalist mission in countries where combat operations were conducted, Smirnov said. There was loss of life although incompatible [as received] with casualties in Afghanistan. As many 193 military advisers and specialists were among our casualties in Afghanistan. Seventy-five of them were killed in Ethiopia and 59 in Angola. The death toll of 1950 surpasses 600 (the death toll in the limited cotingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan amounted to 13,800 people—editor). Many were wounded. Noting that approaches to forms and methods of the Soviet Union's military cooperation with other countries have changed considerably, Smirnov said that there should be attentive attitude to the needs of soldiers-internationalists in the USSR.

Baltic Republics

Thatcher, Baltic Legislators Discuss Developments

LD2905133391 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 0530 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] At the UK Embassy in Moscow, a meeting took place yesterday between Margaret Thatcher, former prime minister of Great Britain, and representatives of the legislatures of the three Baltic states. Three deputies arrived for the talk from Latvia and Estonia. Lithuania was represented only by former prime minister Kazimiera Prunskiene.

Margaret Thatcher listened to the analysis of the situation in the Baltic states given by the deputies and also expressed her standpoint. In the opinion of Margaret Thatcher, first of all the question of unity of all three republics must be solved, because the status of the Baltic states considerably differs from the status of the other republics which do not intend to sign the union treaty. Thatcher also described the policy to be implemented in relation both toward the union and toward the western countries, as tedious, requiring perseverance and patience. Furthermore, the former prime minister of Great Britain noted that as long as the problem among the nine republics is not solved and as long as the nine plus one agreement is not consolidated, diplomatic relations with other republics will not develop. Last of all, Thatcher expressed the opinion that economic disintegration will directly consolidate the political positions of the Baltic states. Margaret Thatcher refrained from making specific proposals.

Baltic Leaders To Discuss OMON Actions 30 May

OW3005051791 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1800 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Vytautas Landsbergis, Anatolijs Gorbunovs and Arnold Ruutel, Chairmen of the Supreme Councils of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are to hold a meeting on May 30 at 17:00 in Vilnius.

Besides matters relating to broader cooperation among the Baltic republics, they will be discussing the actions of the Vilnius and Riga special purpose police units (the OMON) on the borders of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

Latvian Council Wants Removal of Special Militia

LD2905121391 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 0900 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] The Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia this morning adopted a note to the USSR Supreme Soviet and President Mikhail Gorbachev regarding the criminal activity in the territory of the Republic of Latvia by the Special Purpose Militia Detachment [OMON], the interior troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry.

Adopting the note was not that simple. Since yesterday, several circumstances have come to light that testify to the fact that these actions have been planned and are not all unknown, for example, to USSR Internal Affairs Minister Boris Pugo, as it appeared from several interviews of his in the press.

Talavs Jundzis, opening the debate on this question today, announced that at his disposal there is a telephoned telegram with the signature of Boris Pugo saying that to establish a united USSR customs system, it is necessary for those hampering customs posts on the borders of the Baltic republics to be liquidated and that to benefit the development of the USSR market economy, this deblocking of the customs posts was completed. So then, the way was opened for free transport of national economic products on the territory of the USSR.

Jundzis also reported about a letter addressed to Lukyanov with the signature of Boris Pugo, in which it is likewise emphasized that the OMON have carried out undertakings to deblock the main roads closed by the customs posts.

It can be concluded from Boris Pugo's telephoned telegram that the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry is taking a stand for the independent militia units formed by the republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to be disarmed.

In continuing the debate on the text of the note, the leader of the minority faction, Sergejs Dimanis, demanded a break, during which a statement by the opposition faction was prepared. The statement declares that there are many testimonies at the disposal of this faction which reveal that the demolishing of customs posts on the borders of the Republic of Latvia was completed already beforehand and that only then were those facts of demolishing attributed to the OMON.

The opposition faction did not participate in the voting on the note, but for its text 99 deputies of the 135 present cast their vote.

The note states that the uncontrollability and impunity on the part of the OMON has caused a series of serious crimes about which the highest establishments of power and administration of the Republic of Latvia have informed, on several occasions, the USSR president and government, demanding these units be disbanded or taken away from Latvia. A reply has not been received to this proposal.

Ignoring the Republic of Latvia's demands shows that preserving OMON on Latvian territory is a component part of the policy of the center, and its purpose is to maintain political tension and to destabilize the situation in the republic.

On the basis of these facts, the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia demands, without delay, disbanding or taking away from the republic the OMON, ensuring

the guilty persons are called to criminal accountability as well as compensating for the damage caused.

In the event of the demands not being complied with, the responsibility must be assumed by the USSR president.

The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lativa at the plenary sitting today appointed Valdis Stals director general of the state archives of the Republic of Latvia. Two people's judges of the city of Riga rayons were elected to fill vacancies.

The Supreme Council is now examining the draft laws begun last week.

Latvia Fears Renewed Attacks on Customs Posts

OW3005051991 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1230 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] The Latvian parliament is in possession of a copy of the cable by the interior minister, Mr Boris Pugo, sent to regional interior ministers saying that the emegence of customs posts on the border of some republics and illegal traffic control were giving rise to local protest. The cable speaks of incidents in which policemen are being involved in those operations. The minister desoribed all of that as a gross violation of the federal legislation as well as of Mr Gorbachev's decree of April 12, 1991.

Mr Pugo informed that he ordered police units not to be involved in the operation of those customs posts.

The press secretary of the Latvian parliament, Mr Aleksandr Mirlin, told a BF [BALFTAX] correspondent that the parliament was in possession of information saying new operations were planned to eliminate the customs posts on Thursday, May 30. Since Latvian policemen stay put at the posts, Mr. Pugo's cable gives grounds for launching an operation against them because of disobedience to the minister's order.

Estonia's deputy interior minister, Mr Arvet Jaaska, told a BF correspondent his ministry had also received a similar cable from Mr Pugo banning the involvement of police units in the operation of border and customs services. However, said Mr Jaaska, militia structures in Estonia were overhauled on March 1, 1991 and under agreement of August 6, 1990 signed by Mr Savisaar and the former interior minister Mr Bakatin, Estonian police are independent. Therefore, he said, Mr Pugo's cable is not mandatory to the local police.

On recent events in Latvia and Lithuania, as well as Mr Pugo's position, Mr Jaaska described as nonsense attempts at restoring order by illegal means. He likened what had happened to "a warning coming after a gunshot".

Latvian, Soviet Leaders To Meet in Moscow 30 May

OW3005061291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1800 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] The Soviet Premier Valentin Pavlov will meet in Moscow on May 30 with his Latvian colleague Ivars Godmanis to discuss, according to Mr. Godmanis, "purely financial matters connected with Latvia's failure to pay off its share to the national budget."

On Tuesday the Latvian Supreme Council decided that the republic should not pay 340 million rubles to the Soviet budget in spite of the Latvian government's readiness to transfer this sum to the center.

Lithuanian Border Post Attacked; Details Reported

LD2905175791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Audrius Azubalis, the press representative of the Supreme Council, started today's traditional briefing with news causing concern.

The Lavariskes border and customs checkpoint was attacked last night. At 2130 it was approached by a Ural class military vehicle. About 15 armed men jumped out and beat the customs officials. The shift leader, (Algimantas Micickas), and customs officer Vladas Stasiunas were hospitalized. (Micickas) has broken ribs and suffered a concussion. The customs hut was engulfed in flames 19 minutes after the attack.

Audrius Azubalis also reported that the protection of seven customs posts was handed over to the Ministry of Internal Affairs yesterday. Previously their protection was in the care of the country's Defense Department. Among those seven posts was also the Lavariskes post.

Audrius Azubalis said that he had spoken with Internal Affairs Minister Misiukonis, who told him that this post should have been guarded by officials of the Vilnius Rayon police commissariat, who were present. The minister did not comment on the incident in detail because an investigation is under way.

More news Audrius Azubalis relayed, with a smile, was that yesterday, TASS reported that Vilkaviskis communists were protesting that Soviet passports were being taken away from the working people, and certificates as the Lithuanian citizens being issued instead. Aurdrius Azubalis said that there have been no reports of people having documents taken from them.

'Armed Resistance' Possible

LD2905211991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1647 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Our attention remains focused on the Baltic republics. Today, as a whole, the situation there was more tranquil than yesterday.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent Yura Sinkievichius] From today on, all Lithuanian customs houses are again operating round the clock. Representatives of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry Lukashev and Shalayev have arrived in Vilnius to examine the attacks on these houses. Despite that, during the past night one more border control post—the 13th in 10 nights—was destroyed, this time in Lavariskes. Two people were injured.

The [Lithuanian] Supreme Soviet discussed the question of armed resistance. OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] has been declared a criminal organization. The decision adopted that every person has the right to defend himself and the state. This does not preclude the possibility of armed resistance.

[K. Moteka, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet—as captioned—interviewed inside Supreme Soviet] If the black berets and OMON subunits which carry out such actions against our republic are criminals, of course we will treat them as criminals.

[Sinkievichius] Deputy Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Kazimieras Moteka said these words after Boris Pugo, inspired by Nevzorov's latest masterpiece, had to condemn the actions by the Latvian and Lithuanian OMON. [end recording]

Landsbergis Cited on Baltic Council Meeting

LD2905231291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1715 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Excerpts] Vilnius, 29 May (TASS)—A session of the Baltic Council is scheduled to take place on Thursday, 30 May, in the Lithuanian capital. This is a consultative-coordinating body, which resumed its activities last spring, soon after the parliaments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia adopted resolutions on restoring their statehood. The leaders of these republics are members of the Council, and they have been assembled to work out a common line and strategy, and to reach agreement on the actions the republics are to take in the areas of politics, the economy, and other areas.

Vytautas Landsbergis has stated that tomorrow's session of the Baltic Council will, first and foremost, be devoted to discussion of "the situation taking shape in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in relation to the new way in which obviously illegal force is being used against our state institutions." [passage omitted]

Of course, the incidents which have taken place on the border between Belorussia and Latvia, where sections of the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs destroyed border control and customs posts. This has heightened the already tense situation in the republic. In spite of the fact that actions of this nature have been evaluated fairly critically by Boris Pugo, the USSR minister of internal affairs, and by Vadim Bakatin, a candidate in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic presidential elections, they continue.

As Vytautas Landsbergis stated in a recent interview for the Russian broadcast of Radio Independent Lithuania [radio nezavisimoy litvyy], at tomorrow's session of the Baltic Council a common line on "how to oppose this and how to cooperate in this area" needs to be worked out.

'Rebellious' Republics Said To Face Sanctions

LD2905221691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 2130 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Today, Radio Vilnius received a copy of a document drawn up by the Soviet Union's Planning Committee which indicates what sanctions Moscow intends to impose on the republics which refuse to sign the new Union treaty. The document envisages that the independence-seeking republics will have to buy out the property under Soviet jurisdiction on their territories. An alternative provides for joint ownership of such property, with the Soviet Union taking no less than 50 percent of the shares.

It is not excluded that some Soviet subordinated enterprises will be closed down and their equipment taken to the Soviet Union.

The rebellious republics may have to pay a certain part of the Soviet Union's foreign and home debts, while credits and money supplies to them will be cut off.

The document of the Soviet Planning Committee intends a sharp decrease in supplies of raw materials and manufactured goods in high demand, while the flow of imported production is to be stopped altogether. Concurrently, Moscow intends to completely refuse to buy the production of the rebellious republics, as its prices were up to now higher than those on the world market. Besides, Moscow considers the possibility of switching over to world prices in trading with the nonaligning republics.

Last week the Lithuanian prime minister, Gediminas Vagnorius, sent a telegram to his Soviet counterpart, Valentin Pavlov, pointing out among other things that in case appropriate political decisions were made, Lithuania could find it possible to participate in Moscow's anticrisis program and sign a treaty of economic cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Armed Forces Demand Enlistment of Lithuanians

LD3005083791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 0600 GMT 30 May 91

[Text] Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis, received a letter yesterday from the generals of the Soviet Union's Armed Forces [names indistinct] and from the Soviet Union's deputy minister of

defense [name indistinct] about the problems of the Soviet Union's Armed Forces.

It is demanded that young men of the Lithuanian Republic serve in the Soviet Army or [words indistinct] to be paid in cash, that the Lithuanian Republic complies with the order of the Soviet Union's Cabinet of Ministers on the Soviet Army 1991 draft. The Soviet Armed Forces General Staff has the right to take any measures otherwise.

The Lithuanian Supreme Council chairman notes that the citizens of the Lithuanian Republic [passage imdistinct] are not obliged to serve in a foreign army and the Soviet Union's military leadership is well aware of this. New threats of the Soviet Union's Armed Forces to Lithuania remind of their actions in Vilnius last January. These threats do not contribute to the endeavors of creating an atmosphere of constitutional negotiations, or maybe it is an attempt to disturb it before the beginning of negotiations. It is regretable that the Soviet Union does not give up the technique of ultimatums [words indistinct]. Neither Lithuania nor its citizens are the Soviet Union's [word indistinct].

RSFSR

Nuclear Power Ministry Denies 'Explosions'

LD2905150791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1314 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] [Announcer] Next to me is our commentator, Valeriy Kiosa. As I have already said, the rumors about some kind of explosion in the Moscow area have not been confirmed. Yet... Valeriy, let us have the details. I think that is the best way to deal with all the rumors:

[Kiosa] The radio station has indeed received a very great number of phone calls in the last few hours, since early this morning. People have given the widest possible variety of locations for the accidents which have allegedly taken place in Moscow or Moscow Oblast: Dubna, Obninsk, Stupino. We could not, or simply did not, have the right not to react to this, to respond to what was worrying our listeners. God knows we have tried very hard to be the first to report that something really had happened, some kind of sensation, one might say. Wherever we turned, whatever efforts we made, we were disappointed. There is no sensation because, according to many departments, quite simply nothing has happened. To support this, let us turn to information we obtained from Yuriy Sergeyevich Osipov, the head of Moscow hydrometeorology and environmental monitoring. According to his data, the meteorology network of the center had not registered any deviations from the norm, save for the strong storms over the past 24 hours in Moscow. You will remember what happened over our city last night. The civil defense headquarters for Moscow and Moscow Oblast, where the Moscow hydrometeorology center also inquired later, failed to register any kind of explosions or any abnormal, so to speak, phenomena.

God only knows, as they say. Of course, we decided once again to check the radiation situation in Moscow and in Moscow Oblast. To compare, let me say that a level of 20 microroentgens per hour and lower is deemed to correspond to background radiation. So, here are the very latest figures on these levels in Moscow and Moscow Oblast: In Lenino, Dachnoye, 13 micro-roentgen per hour; at Naro-Fominsk, 13; Odintsovo, 12; Kashira 13; and, literally right next to us, at the national economic achievements exhibition, 10 micro-roentgen per hour. We can be absolutely calm. Yuriy Sergeyevich Osipov suggested that one possible reason for these rumurs—let's put it like that—was the very strong storms which thundered over Moscow last night.

[Announcer] You know that people were talking as if there was some kind of nuclear explosion somewhere in Moscow Oblast.

[Kiosa] They were saying that somewhere in Moscow Oblast a nuclear reactor exploded, that there was an emission, and, indeed, we also did get calls like this. Of course, we could not fail to react to that, so we got in touch with the Ministry of Nuclear Power Engineering and the Nuclear Industry of the USSR, where we got answers from Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Medvedev, aide to the minister. I spoke to him literally five or seven minutes ago.

He said that on 28 and 29 May at all enterprises and nuclear stations of the Ministry of Nuclear Power Engineering and the nuclear industry there were no explosions or emergencies of any kind, nor was there any truth in information about the accidents or similar unpleasant things that had allegedly taken place at enterprises under this ministry in Moscow, Moscow Oblast, or the towns of Dubna and Obninsk. As for Stupino, as Aleksandr Aleksandrovich said, there are not any Minatomenergoprom enterprises there at all.

To draw this story to a close, I would like to say that, as we have been told by the government commission on emergencies, there have been no explosions or similar undesirable and dreadful things observed in Moscow or Moscow Oblast. That is the information we have been able to get today from both the meteorological service and Minatomenergoprom.

[Announcer] So, on that note, our listeners can rest easy. I think we can count the lack of bad news to be good news, do you not? Thank you. That was Valeriy Kiosa, Mayak correspondent and commentator.

Ministry Responds to Rumors

LD2905145191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Rumors have been circulating in the corridors of the Ostankino television center—where we work—all

day about harmful substances being emitted into the atmosphere near Stupino, near Moscow. In this regard, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs press center reports that civil defense exercises were carried out today at one of the enterprises in Krasnogorsk, where the instructors taught people how to extinguish fires. The exercises are over, the press center says, and the administration of the enterprise has now started examining the results. This is all the information we have. I got it via TASS and must admit that I still don't understand whether there were emissions in Stupino or not. It seems that these few lines are nice and comforting so (?that people shouldn't be worried).

Moscow Authorities Investigate

LD2905133391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1200 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Since early morning our radio station has been inundated by phone calls from listeners who ask with concern whether it is really true that a terrible explosion occurred somewhere in Moscow or Moscow Oblast last night. We have tried to get answers to these questions. Over to correspondent Valeriy Kiosa:

[Kiosa] Esteemed listeners, I want to tell you immediately about the information which I was given literally minutes ago by Yuriy Sergeyevich Osipov, head of the Moscow Hydrometeorology and Environment Monitoring Center. The Moscow center's meteorological network did not register any deviations from the norm over 24 hours, except for strong storms. However, despite this and considering the rumors which are current in the city and oblast, the Moscow hydrometeorology center got in touch with the Moscow Oblast civil defense headquarters, where they said that they, also, had no data about any sort of explosions. The Moscow center also received the same information from the operations duty officer of the Moscow city civil defense headquarters.

There were telephone calls to the effect that a plane had allegedly crashed in the Sheremetyevo Airport area last night. As Yuriy Sergeyevich Osipov said, he had got in touch with the Sheremetyevo Airport chief, and no data on this is being confirmed.

However, to check this information, the Moscow hydrometeorology center network is now carrying out additional measurements of the radiation conditions on Moscow and Moscow Oblast, and once we have received then we will immediately put them on the air. Apart from that, we are in touch with other organizations concerned, and we will immediately let you have any information as and when it comes in.

Yeltsin's 28 May Activities in Severomorsk Noted

PM2905154791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 May 91 First Edition p 5

["Direct Line" report by Captain Third Rank P. Ishchenko: "B. Yeltsin's Trip"]

[Text] Severomorsk, 28 May—The latest trip around regions of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] by RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman B. Yeltsin has started in Severomorsk and Murmansk. The trip to the polar region is of a "working nature," Yeltsin stated on arriving in Murmansk in the evening of 27 May. However, when answering journalists' questions he did not rule out the possibility that the topic of the upcoming Russian presidential elections might be broached during the meetings.

Early in the morning of 28 May, Yeltsin laid a wreath at the memorial to defenders of the Soviet polar region in Murmansk. A discussion with Admiral F. Gromov, fleet commander in chief, took place at Northern Fleet headquarters in Severomorsk afterwards.

During the discussion there was an exchange of opinions about the draft document on social protection for servicemen, prepared by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. According to Boris Nikolayevich, he had intended to sign the document immediately after his meeting with the Northern Fleet sailors, but following proposals and comments by the leadership of the fleet and the oblast, the signing has been postponed for two-three days, which are needed to finalize the draft.

Yeltsin inspected the Kirov nuclear-propelled guided missile cruiser and met the ship's personnel and the command and military political personnel of a ship squadron. The leader of the Russian parliament noted that the RSFSR can and must take it upon itself to look after servicemen's social and material welfare. The reply to a question of how Russia intends to provide social protection for servicemen autonomously, without participation by other Union republics, was as follows: "The question is apt, and this was indicated during the meeting with the fleet command. Obviously, consultations will have to be held with other republics in order to resolve this problem in its entirety."

'Not Friends' With Gorbachev

PM2905155591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[ROSTASS report: "Candidate in the Arctic"]

[Text] Murmansk, 28 May—RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Chairman B.N. Yeltsin, who is in Murmansk, persistently stressed at meetings with journalists that his trip to the Soviet Arctic is purely a business call and was planned at the start of the year. This is confirmed by local leaders. However, the majority of northerners are firmly convinced that Boris Nikolayevich has begun his election campaign for the post of Russian Federation president with precisely this visit to Murmansk and Severomorsk.

It is no accident that one of the first questions put to him during his meeting with sailors on the Kirov nuclear-propelled guided missile cruiser was: How does he rate his chances of victory in this campaign?

"I think that each candidate for the presidency is reckoning to win, and so at this time I would not like to make any kind of forecasts or guesses," B.N. Yeltsin answered. "Everything depends on the voters...."

At his meeting with Northern Fleet sailors, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman spoke at length about the measures that the Russian Federation parliament intends to take in order to protect the rights of servicemen and their families.

Answering a question about his attitude to M.S. Gorbachev as a person and not as a political opponent, B.N. Yeltsin remarked: "We are not friends. But we hold major state posts. Therefore, in our relationship there should be no quarrels or anything that impedes our work. We call one another almost daily and have normal businesslike conversations. But as yet we have not sat down at the dinner table together...."

The head of the Russian parliament was optimistic about the conclusion of the new Union treaty. As far as the Russian Federation is concerned, in his opinion it should manage its own natural resources autonomously and should maintain businesslike ties with other sovereign states directly, and not through the center.

After his trip to Murmansk, B.N. Yeltsin intends to visit other Russian industrial centers west of the Urals.

Yeltsin's Northern Tour Continues 29 May

Visits Petrozavodsk, Karelia

OW3005041691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] On Wednesday the chairman of Russia's parliament Boris Yeltsin is staying in Karelia in the framework of his tour of Russia's north. His today's program includes visits to the Kondopoga pulp and paper mill outside Petrozavodsk and to other plants in the republic of Karelia. Yeltsin arrived in Karelia's administrative center Petrozavodsk Tuesday evening. He is expected to sign with the chairman of Karelia's parliament Viktor Stepanov, a document on economic development in Karelia and on conditions for transition to free market.

Prior to this departure from Murmansk the day before Boris Yeltsin met with local people's deputies and spokesmen for the public. Describing plans for developing the northern areas he said that it had been decided to stimulate their economy. There are plans to let the local plants retain 10 percent of their output as their own property.

When asked about the ways to divide powers between the center and the republics, Boris Yeltsin said he believes that railways, power base and the armed forces should be run by the center. He wants to stress, said Boris Yeltsin, that the armed forces should be unified, and that he has no plans to create Russia's own army. There were discussions, he said, on the possibility of placing civil defence units and commissariats under republican jurisdiction. These services are connected with the work of local councils and therefore they know their potentialities better, Yeltsin explained. All these problems, he added, should be discussed with the defense minister Dmitriy Yazov.

Approves Wider Autonomy for Karelia

OW3005031391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, Chairman of the Russian republican Supreme Soviet who is touring the Northern part of Russia has signed a document widening economic independence of Karelia and stipulating new financing regulations. Specifically, in 1991-1993 Karelia will retain part of its income and a share of stabilisation fund which were previously allocated to the Russian republican budget.

The Karelian republic will also keep 75 percent of its hard currency earnings, with the remainder going to the Russian budget. "In a sense this regulation runs counter to the recent Presidential Decree that introduced a 40 percent tax on republics' hard currency incomes. We have discussed the issue with President Mikhail Gorbachev and I did not conceal my dissatisfaction with the Decree, which I believe hinders the development of export industries in this country. This (new regulation) however should in no way be considered as a step to confrontation, but rather as a necessary measure to speed up the economic development of Karelia" said Yeltsin.

Karelia will be entitled from now on to set taxation ceilings and tax rebates for all industrial enterprises located on its territory.

A long-term agreement on economic cooperation between Karelia and Russia is to be signed shortly, enabling karelia to gain access to hard currency credits which Russia will receive from the central government. The (Karelian) republic is authorized to carry out barter trade and licence its exports (which form part of Russian exports). Karelia will preseve 15 percent of the goods produced for its own needs. Out of these 10 percent will be disposed of by the republican authorities and the remaining 5 percent—by industrial enterprises themselves. Karelia has also been granted the right to establish businesses abroad. Speaking at a meeting with workers of local industrial enterprises in the city of Petrozavodsk Boris Yeltsin said that "Russia has refused to render any aid to Afghanistan". He said he had informed about that decision both President Gorbachev and Afghan President Najibullah, and that the latter was clearly displeased by the news. Acording to Yeltsin, Russia has been appropriating $280 million a year in aid to Afghanistan, so he suggested that the countries trade goods in that amount. "By and large Russia is not going to provide disinterested aid to other countries,—Yeltsin said, adding—Charity begins at home." [sentence puncturation as received]

The visit to Petrozavodsk brought to an end Yeltsin's Northern tour, which also included trips to Murmansk and the Soviet Northern Fleet military base in Severomorsk.

Meets With Workers

LD2905205291 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1647 GMT 29 May 91

[Alesandr Shashkov video report from Petrozavodsk; from the "Vesti" program]

[Text] After Murmansk, the next stop in Boris Yeltsin's tour is Karelia. All this in one day in order to get acquainted with the main problems, and to attempt to discover ways to resolve them.

[Begin Yeltsin recording] We are bringing with us two documents—projects—which we would like to sign here tomorrow. The first one, on the whole, about the principles of the development of the northern regions of the Russian Federation, and the second, a totally specific one, well, as it were, most-favored-treatment for the republic from the point of view of its development, especially in the social sphere. [end recording]

[Shashkov] After having familiarized himself with the Kondopoga pulp and paper combine—where Boris Yeltsin showed interest in the workers's living conditions, and in how production influences the environment—he met with the management of Karelia's paper industry. In Novaya Vilga—the headquarters of Vadim Tumanov's construction cooperative is situated there—representatives of the largest construction and industrial cooperatives gathered, along with Nikolay Travkin, the president of their union. Boris Yeltsin listened to the cooperative workers' complaints and proposals. He immediately abolished the RSFSR Supreme Soviet decision limiting the wages fund for construction organizations. [Video shows Yeltsin touring combine and chatting to management; car trip to Novaya Vilga; meeting with cooperative workers, and abolishing decision] Here outside the Council of Ministers' building, one more very important document is being signed. It concerns the perestroyka of the structure of the national economy in the conditions of the market.

Boris Yeltsin will then meet the representatives of Petrazavodsk labor collectives, after which he will set off for Tula.

Economic Document With Karelia Signed

LD2905202891 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 29 May 91

[By ROSTASS correspondent V. Zlobin]

[Text] Petrozavodsk May 29 TASS—Measures, which are provided for in a document signed by Russian Parliament Chairman Boris Yeltsin here today, will help broaden Karelia's economic independence.

The major of these measures is a decision that allocations from the all-state incomes formed on the territory of Karelia and subject to remittance to the Russian Federation budget will remain at Karelia's disposal in 1991-1993.

In subsequent five years, the above-mentioned allocations will also remain in Karelia but already on the terms of credit at three per cent per annum. This will create favourable conditions for an accelerated development of Karelia, since the level of its residents' well-being considerably lags behind their contribution to the country's economy.

The Russian Parliament leader met representatives of the work collectives of Petrozavodsk. He told them about measures which had already been taken by the Russian Parliament and government to raise the living standards of the population.

In response to a question from the audience as to whose interests he upholds, Yeltsin said that he upholds primarily the interests of the less protected sections of society that account for 40 million people in Russia.

About his relations with Mikhail Gorbachev, Yeltsin said that they are quite businesslike and that there is no and should not be anything personal about them. "But, for the sake of Russia's sovereignty I do not intend to give up anything," he specified.

Yeltsin Officially Begins Election Campaign

OW3005040591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Boris Yeltsin's personal spokesman Gennadiy Burbulis and the leader of Yeltsin's campaign team Aleksandr Muzykantski have told a news conference in Moscow that it signals the official beginning of Mr. Yeltsin's election campaign. According to Mr. Burbulis, the head of the RSFSR parliament will make a trip to Tula on May 30, and to Voronezh on may 31.

At 10 a.m. on June [no date as received] Mr. Yeltsin will meet (at Oktyabr movie theater in Moscow) with activists of various political parties and movements, as well as worker representatives, to spell out his election program. On June 3 he will resume his tour of the republic.

According to Mr. Burbulis, the candidate Vice-President Aleksandr Rutskoy will pay visits to Barnaul, Novosibirsk, Krasnoyarsk and Irkutsk on June 1-5, and a few days later will make trips to Lipetsk, Orel and Kursk, and also Volgograd or Krasnodar.

Asked by IF's [INTERFAX's] reporter if there had been reports of attempts to pressure Soviet Army or interior troop servicemen into voting for some concrete presidential candidate, Mr. Burbulis said "there've been lots of such reports, and their number is still on the rise." He observed that "it is impermissible to darken the first truly popular presidential elections by various incidents, among them criminally colored ones."

Campaign Director Holds News Conference

LD2905202291 Moscow TASS in English 2001 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Boris Yeltsin's chief argument in contesting the post of Russia's president "will be practical actions that he will be able to take together with the parliament and government of Russia, including those in the near future", USSR people's deputy Gennadiy Burbulis, director of Yeltsin's election campaign, told a news conference here today.

"On June 12 (Russia's presidential election date) every resident of Russia will choose not so much the candidacy of Russia's first president as his or her own programme in life, a programme for the revival of Russia," Burbulis said.

To explain this to Russia's citizens is the main principle in the conduct of Yeltsin's election campaign, Burbulis added.

At journalists' request, Burbulis commented on the attitude of the leadership of Tatarstan who recently declared that Russia's presidential elections would not be held on Tatarstan's territory.

Referring to his talk with a spokesman for the Tatarstan Parliament today, Burbulis said that the electoral commission of that republic had already printed ballot papers for the presidential elections and that district electoral commissions would "ensure conditions for all those who wish it to participate in the polling".

At the same time there is no official document to this effect from the Tatarstan Parliament up to now, Burbulis noted.

Speaking about the possibility of a meeting between Yeltsin and Tatarstan Parliament Chairman Mintimer Shaimiyev, Burbulis admitted that "the Tatarstan Parliament's decision is puzzling" and that "it is not ruled out that an additional talk will be needed".

Yeltsin Discusses Communism, Democracy

LD2905125891 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 0830 GMT 29 May 91

[Interview with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet, by program presenter Polish film director Krzystof Zanussi; place and date not given; from the "How Are You, Russia?" program—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Zanussi] Politics is a high risk business. They say that we have [words indistinct] I hope that after our conversation I can ask for your autograph. I see that you have had strange events in your life. This is, of course, of interest to people who don't know you. Do you think that there have been any attempts on you? Or was it a coincidence what happened in the car?

[Yeltsin] You see, it's too many coincidences for one person. This gives rise, of course, to suspicion, yes, too many coincidences. I don't want to draw conclusions on each case, but there's one, two, three, four, five, six of them, you see. [passage omitted]

[Zanussi] You're the only politician in the USSR who had power, was in a position of power, but who left, was in retirement, and then came back again. This is a rarity in Russian history, in general.

[Yeltsin] You see, the first time I got through, evidently, by chance, they didn't notice that I was a democrat.

[Zanussi] Were you already a democrat then, even though you were in the (?party) at that time?

[Yeltsin] Yes, yes. Well, not one that had taken final form, but already one that had certain principles, as a democrat. They put every candidate through a tiny narrow glass tube; they pulled them through, pulled me through, too, and still, they didn't notice these qualities and admitted me to membership of the Politburo. When I saw this system from inside, it was then that I showed my anger and disagreement with this system. [passage omitted]

[Yeltsin] I have documents from the people who made this montage, who altered the speed of the film, and so on.

[Zanussi] Even that?

[Yeltsin] Even that, in writing. Moreover, they are from a person who presented this evidence in writing and gave these materials to a Supreme Soviet commission that was set up at that time.

[Zanussi] It was clear manipulation of opinions.

[Yeltsin] Absolutely, absolutely.

[Zanussi] It also happens as a means of struggle.

[Yeltsin] It is a means of struggle. How many other means of struggle are there? What is happening to us now at the congress? Isn't that a means of struggle?

[Zanussi] That was an open insult.

[Yeltsin] You understand. Yes. Yes, tough criticism of this kind is simply an insult, but these are the defects of the system. There's no other. They have no other methods. They're carried out mechanically, these methods. These are CPSU methods.

[Zanussi] But, you also worked in this CPSU for many years.

[Yeltsin] Yes.

[Zanussi] I remember that you wrote in your book about your work in Sverdlovsk. A well-known event took place

at that time—you write about it in your book—that the house where Tsar Nicholas II was killed was demolished. In the book, you explain. Perhaps you could explain to us once again how it happened?

[Yeltsin] Well, it's quite easy to explain the so-called Ipatyev House, a two-story brickhouse in the cellar of which the family of Nicholas II was shot. I was just elected first secretary. I was still a young man. I received a Politburo decision signed by Brezhnev: Pull it down in three days.

[Zanussi] afterward [words indistinct].

[Yeltsin] But later, they explained it by saying that—not later, but when I telephoned—by saying that speculation on this issue is taking place throughout the world, that each time there is some date or other articles appear in the international press saying that this was violence, lawlessness, and so on and so forth. Many people tried to get to Sverdlovsk to look at this house, but Sverdlovsk is a closed city, so it was impossible to get there, and again there was indignation. So, it had to be demolished to stop these arguments and disputes. I objected indignantly and telephoned. They told me that it's a question of party discipline, a Politburo decision. You are first secretary of the party oblast committee. Carry it out immediately! If it was happening today, I would simply have shown indiscipline and wouldn't have done it, but at that time I hadn't yet advanced to today's level of thinking.

[Zanussi] Nevertheless, you spent many a long year working in the apparatus. You were a Communist. How did you manage to achieve this change so that you became a democrat?

[Yeltsin] Of course, this is not a process that takes place in one single moment. It's not the birth of a person. It is the formation of a new thinking, so to speak. Nevertheless, it did begin in Sverdlovsk, but it showed itself particularly vividly when I was a Politburo member. It was precisely there that I saw from within the rot of this system, the flawed nature of this system. Being a rebel by nature, I began to rebel against this system, for which they drove me out of the Politburo.

[Zanussi] In general, in Russia's history, there are instances where rebels sometimes achieved something. There was Pugachev, but....

[Yeltsin, interrupting] But, he did not get into power.

[Zanussi] He didn't?

[Yelstin] That's right, he didn't. Then, I am not a rebel of the type such as to rouse the whole people to rebellion. No, what I want is to replace this system peacefully.

[Zanussi] But the episode with the demolition of this house where the tsar was killed was fairly typical for the history of Russia, the tendency that often in Russia they made the attempt simply to forget and to destroy the memory, if it tries to forget its past, and it seems to me that perhaps this is a hindrance to developing today's Russia, the problems of memories, the problem of lies which have gone deep in the life of society.

[Yeltsin] I completely agree with you. How can you fail to be indignant if, for example, when the general plan for the city of Moscow was confirmed in 1935, Kaganovich wrote that Moscow had no Russian spirit about it at all, and that 2,200 various monuments and churches and so on were to be demolished, and they were demolished.

[Zanussi] Including the church (?of the great redeemer).

[Yeltsin] Quite so.

[Zanussi] That was also demolished at that time?

[Yeltsin] Yes, then.

[Zanussi] As a symbol of Russian (?traditions)?

[Yeltsin] Quite so. It is barbarism, there is no other name for it. Now, we are returning to this, to a certain extent, first to the evaluation of it and second to a certain restoration of churches and monuments of antiquity. This process is going on, and, for instance, I have already had several meetings with the head of our orthodox church, Aleksey II, patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, and today I will probably go to a church service devoted to the great feast of Easter. We have also discussed these problems, and, in general, we have a whole program for restoring monuments.

[Zanussi] But Christianity for Russia is something very important, and so it seems that the destruction of this Christianity is something that did great harm to this nation.

[Yeltsin] It, too, must be restored. It must also be restored in people's hearts, its morality, because the decline in spirituality, in culture, stemmed from this, as well. This was one reason why they took the church and started blaming it for all ills and started considering that believers were not worthwhile people.

[Zanussi] But you are not yourself a believer, are you?

[Yeltsin] That's right. Of course, I have had the rules of atheism drummed into me—although I was baptized—for too many decades. Of course, they go very deep, and so it is difficult to turn oneself inside out, just to say today I am a nonbeliever, so to speak, and then wake up tomorrow and become a believer. No, this process probably has to go on very, very slowly and gradually, acquiring forther morality, a certain moral purging.

[Zanussi] As far as I know, in the traditions of orthodoxy, in Eastern religiosity, (?eastern) Christianity, wealth is somehow always linked with sin, and wealthy people are considered more sinful people, and so I am afraid.... [changes thought] To what extent am I right if I, as a foreigner, suspect that this could become an obstacle in changing society, modern society, this ancient tradition which is deeply rooted in the hearts of people?

[Yeltsin] Yes, I think that, in psychological terms, this will be an obstacle to the more rapid development of this process. Nevertheless, it is inevitable, and this process will proceed. [passage omitted]

Candidates Bakatin, Ryzhkov Continue Campaign

PM3005093491 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Extracts from RIA reports: "Russia: Chronicle of Pre-election Marathon"]

[Text] Vadim Bakatin, one of the Russian presidential candidates, has visited Nizhniy Novgorod. He held his first meeting with voters at the "Krasnoye Sormovo" plant. Afterward the presidential candidate headed for the television center. Nizhniy Novgorod television, which does not usually work on Saturdays, prepared a "Press Center" broadcast for the occasion. Bakatin answered questions regarding his family and his relations with Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin, and expounded certain points of his election program.

"I am against rashly jumping into market relations. It will lead to the enrichment of a narrow group of people at the expense of the main mass of workers," Russian presidential candidate Nikolay Ryzhkov stated at a meeting with Moscow region voters in Krasnogorsk. He said that he had worked out a "range of firm and decisive measures" to save Russia. He spoke in favor of a transition to the market in stages, against private ownership of land, and also against the "disintegration of the Soviet Union." "Only strong rule can save the country," he noted.

Ryzhkov Takes Campaign to Krasnoyarsk Plant

PM2905154191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Correspondent Yu. Khots report: "N. Ryzhkov—It Will Be A Hard Fight!"]

[Text] Krasnoyarsk—Krasnoyarsk has become the third major Russian city, after Lipetsk and Smolensk, to play host to N.I. Ryzhkov's ongoing election campaign for the post of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president. Here he met representatives of the ""Yenisey' Khimicheskiy Kombinat" Production Association's labor collective.

This is not the first visit to the city on the Yenisey River by the former chairman of the country's Council of Ministers. While still head of the Union Government, he came here to visit the building site for a major plant producing heavy excavators, and other enterprises.

Outlining the aim of the current trips around Russia, the candidate noted that this aim was to once again check his program against the people's mood and life's realities.

The meetings at one of Siberia's largest defense enterprises—the ""Yenisey' Khimicheskiy Kombinat"—were also devoted to this very theme. After touring the enterprise and talking with the workers, the guest addressed the representatives of the entire labor collective. The contender perceives social protection for the individual in the conditions of transition to the market economy as his main task. In his view, no less than 92 percent of the republic's population need such protection. They are the ones who are most likely to suffer during the radical change in economic policy.

N.I. Ryzhkov pointed out that he had proposed and continues to press for a gradual and regulated transfer to the market. Decisions to the contrary can only produce serious social shock waves. Expounding his view of the country's price hikes in April, the candidate expressed categorical opposition to the measures being carried out and called them a "hasty step." After recalling the storm of protests provoked last year by his government's plan to increase prices by a total amount of 160 billion rubles [R], the contender estimated the current burden of price hikes for the people at R311 billion.

The "Yenisey" meeting's participants adopted a resolution urging all the region's inhabitants to cast their vote at the elections for Russia's first president in favor of N.I. Ryzhkov.

Deputy Groups Back Ryzhkov

914B0176A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 25 May 91 p 1

["Appeal of RSFSR People's Deputies—Participants in a Meeting with Candidate for President of Russia N.I. Ryzhkov"]

[Text] We, people's deputies of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]—agricultural specialists and industrialists who represent the "Food and Health" deputy groups and part of the members of the "Industrial Union" group—perceive with approval the principal propositions of the program of N.I. Ryzhkov, candidate for president of Russia. It expresses the interests of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, as well as that of pensioners, youth and students, soldier-internationalists, and servicemen.

The program defines the key positions of our economy and the way out of its crisis situation. Among a number of questions and problems, N.I. Ryzhkov gives the food problem first place.

We support not only the program, but also the candidacy of N.I. Ryzhkov. Nikolay Ivanovich has an important school of life behind him, and he has traveled the road from major economic manager to head of the government of the country.

Occupying one of the highest state posts of the USSR, he gained genuine all-Union recognition and respect and significant international prestige. Nikolay Ivanovich has displayed the qualities of a manager with principles who is able to defend his position. It is not his fault that not

everything he proposed in the fight to preserve and increase the might of the Fatherland was accomplished, and that support of decisive political forces was inadequate. Methodical pressure on the head of government on the part of radicals in the USSR Supreme Soviet, and also the mass media, had an effect.

Love for his people, and important and all-round experience in state work, a profound knowledge of problems of the economy, a clear and consistent civic position, an ability to evaluate the situation realistically and to make those decisions which respond to the interests of the country to the greatest degree—these are the reliable guarantees of the fulfillment of his program when he possesses the authority of RSFSR president. His high personal qualities are well-known and have been verified in work—intellect, honesty, modesty, decency, high culture, strong family ties, and the ability in his work to reach the needs of each individual, to listen, to take things to heart, and to share someone else's pain, grief, and suffering.

Let no one be troubled by rumors about the state of his health. Nikolay Ivanovich is in good condition and he is calm and confident of himself.

Thus, representing the interests of an absolute majority of the population of the republic, Nikolay Ivanovich will be a worthy president of Russia!

We think that in the forthcoming tough preelection campaign, Nikolay Ivanovich should be even more persistent and forceful in the achievement of this noble goal.

We appeal to all workers, peasants, and intellectuals of Russia: We will vote for Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov! We will vote for social consolidation, for stability of the situation in society, for getting out of the economic crisis, and for bettering our life! We know that he will not permit the further development of extremism, confrontation, and aggression!

(The appeal was adopted unanimously.)

[Signed] M. Lapshin, chairman of the "Food and Health" group; V. Tsoy, chairman of the "Industrial Union" group; V. Demina, P. Moor, Yu. Kachurin, I. Petrov, S. Bystrov, I. Roshchupkin, V. Parshukov, V. Guskov, B. Chefranov, A. Yaroshenko, V. Nikiforov, A. Nazarchuk, N. Kharitonov, and others.

Thatcher Begins Leningrad Visit 29 May

LD2905195191 Moscow TASS in English 1901 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Kondratenko]

[Text] Leningrad May 29 TASS—Former British prime minister Margaret Thatcher today arrived on a one-day visit to Leningrad. Her itinerary was very intense. Leaving no spare moment for meeting the press. Journalists were not there when Thatcher met Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak, which was regarded as a major setback for glasnost.

Thatcher arrived at the Mariyinsky Palace for the meeting elegant as always, wearing an impeccable red suit matching the decor of the red hall in which the meeting took place.

Soon after she left for Leningrad University where she was met with applause by students and professors in a capacity-full auditorium.

She was welcomed by university rector Stanislav Merkuryev, who stressed that the cordial welcome was being extended to Margaret Thatcher not only as a political leader but also as a colleague with a university degree.

"Your twelve-year tenure as prime minister was not all smooth-riding," he said, "but that Europe has achieved a balanced peace is largely due also to your efforts. We are happy to see university graduates scale such heights. This inspires hope that reason and intelligence will prevail in the world," he said.

In her extensive address to the university audience Thatcher set out her view upon the social development of the Soviet Union, which is now passing through a crucial moment, she said.

She said the Soviet younger generation would either reap the fruit of the decisions made or pay through the nose if those decisions proved faulty. A completely new situation has developed in the country since perestroyka reforms started, she said.

Thatcher called upon the Soviet people not to underestimate their achievements. What seemed inconceivable but a short time ago has become a reality, she said. Having achieved political freedoms it is necessary to move ahead to economic freedoms, Thatcher said. She also touched upon problems of democratic development and free enterprise.

Responding to questions, Thatcher noted that her relations with President Mikhail Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders were quite good and she always talked candidly with them. Asked how she manages to be a popular politician and retain her female charms, Thatcher replied: "I have no idea".

[Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1238 GMT on 29 May, in a shorter report on Mrs. Thatcher's visit to Leningrad adds the following: "Margaret Thatcher had a very lively conversation with Anatoliy Sobchak in Leningrad today. The Iron Lady said that she believes in Russia's economic prospects. Thatcher conceded that she is fully satisfied with the democratic processes under way in the USSR, while noting, it is true, that the KGB continues to present a serious danger to them."]

Cites Admiration for City

LD2905195591 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Kondratenko]

[Text] Leningrad May 29 TASS—Former British prime minister Margaret Thatcher spent the afternoon of her one-day visit to Leningrad taking in the city's art treasures and meeting representatives of the city's business community.

In the Hermitage, an art museum with a collection putting it on a par with the world's best, Thatcher was enraptured both with exhibits reflecting the history of world culture from times immemorial to the present but also with the splendid interior decorations of the Winter Palace which houses this art treasury.

In the house of peace and friendship with peoples of other countries Thatcher met a group of Soviet specialists from a number of enterprises located in Leningrad, representatives of the Union of Cooperators and Foreign Economic Organisations and deputies of the Leningrad City Council.

In the conversation she spoke about her admiration for the city's beauty and praised the decision to establish a free enterprise zone in the Leningrad region.

She expressed hope that the forthcoming meeting of the heads of states and governments of the world's leading industrial countries would be held with the participation of President Mikhail Gorbachev and the Soviet Union would be able to establish wide-ranging contacts with the west under the condition of guarantees and economic stability.

Also on Wednesday, a lunch in honour of Margaret Thatcher was given on behalf of the Leningrad City Council.

Later in the day, Margaret Thatcher left for London upon completing her private visit to the Soviet Union.

Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak and other officials saw her off at Pulkovo airport.

Khasbulatov Discusses RSFSR Congress Work

LD2905131791 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1545 GMT 28 May 91

[Interview with Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet, by program presenter Igor Zbronzhko in Moscow on 28 May; from the "Russian Parliamentary Herald" program—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Zbronzhko] Three days have passed since the end of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies. [passage omitted]

How did the first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet see this congress? Ruslan Imranovich, let's conduct a brief analysis of the congress. What do you regard as most important, ultimately?

[Khasbulatov] The main result is the fact that, first, we carried out—and quite consistently and precisely—the instructions and decisions of the previous third extraordinary congress, which entrusted the Supreme Soviet with finishing off all the necessary documents and legislative acts relating to the introduction of the post of RSFSR president. [passage omitted]

Of course, one should not underestimate the factor, a very important factor, in domestic political life and not just domestic, but also in international politics, relating to the Statement of the Ten. To be frank, I very much hope that all the signatories will adhere strictly to this Statement of the Ten. This is, in my view, the last historical hope for us to preserve the Union and to preserve the RSFSR as unified states. Then, leaders must realize that deviation from this statement is impossible without very serious consequences for the country and for their own personal political futures. I think that this Statement of the Ten also was a very strong, stabilizing factor in the work of the congress. [passage omitted]

Our deputies should, I think, according to all democratic standards, back our leader, all the same. I think that presidium members should also back our leader. After all, if the presidium develops and implements policy and suddenly joins some bloc and supports some other candidate, let us then look at this from the point of view of ethics, morals, morality. Such notions, for example, do not fit in with my understanding of morality at all. [passage omitted]

We want, by late June or July, to complete this whole process of developing the Union treaty. We are highly committed to this. At the congress, I said very firmly, not without reason, that the Union treaty is needed to preserve the unity of Russia, and the unity of Russia is needed to preserve the Union. One is inconceivable without the other. If anyone thinks that Russia can be broken up and some kind of union created, this is an illusion, a bluff. [passage omitted]

A united, truly strong and prosperous Russia is the only factor that can really preserve and strengthen the Union. [passage omitted]

So, who now will put these laws into practice? If we are given the opportunity to carry out what we have, strictly speaking, laid the foundations for, we will really, I can confidently say, be able to bring the economy out of crisis. If someone else comes in as president—I don't want to name anyone personally—everything we have laid the foundations for will be reviewed, and not only the country and Russia will find themselves in the existing and prolonged crisis, but I am afraid of the consequences. This could even worsen the situation to a significant degree.

[Zbronzhko] This will simply be a failure.

[Khasbulatov] It will be a catastrophe, and people must understand that those people who are now setting themselves up in opposition to Yeltsin, under the pretext of democracy and glasnost, are quite simply trying to change the political and economy course of Russia and, indeed, the whole country and to turn it in some unknown direction. I would like to ask this simple question: Some of the things we have done have turned out badly, others well, but what is safer? To trust us and give us the chance of performing the task we are undertaking for a year or two? Or to leap into an unknown maelstrom, as it were? Or rather, quite a well known one. One of them held enormous power for five or six years, and it seems he did a great deal to plunge our country into the abyss of crisis. As for the other candidates, their platforms are generally rather vague, and it seems to me quite wrong to entrust the destiny of a mighty power like Russia into their feeble hands.

[Zbronzhko] I think that Russians will make the right choice.

[Khasbulatov] Thank you.

Silayev Answers Deputies Questions 24 May

LD2505145591 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1934 GMT 24 May 91

[Replies by Ivan Silayev, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic prime minister, to deputies' questions at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] fourth Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin on 24 May, with introductions by session chairman Khasbulatov—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Khasbulatov] Comrade deputies, will 15 minutes be enough for replies to questions? [murmurs of assent] Alright. Microphone no. 1, please.

[(Lokshin)] (Lokshin), Territorial Constituency No. 97, chairman of the deputies' food and health group. Esteemed Ivan Stepanovich, esteemed leaders of the republic. Permit me to put one question on the measures set out by the republic's government in response to the parliamentary question asked by the deputies' food and health group. If the measures set out by you are definitive, and the leaders of Russia are unable to do any more for the regeneration of the countryside, does this not mean that you, Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, and Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, intend to continue as before to resolve the problem of overcoming the crisis through plundering the peasants? [passage omitted]

[Silayev] I thank you, but I wish to ask you a question. How is it posible, when you have not yet heard the information or had the time to analyze it, to make such a preprepared statement? [applause]

[Khasbulatov] Microphone no. 2, please. Your question.

[(Morozov)] Deputy (Morozov), Vladimir Oblast. Ivan Stepanovich, I support you, of course, and I understand the concern which deputy (Lokshin) wishes to demonstrate, but, Ivan Stepanovich, I simply ask you to answer one question. I realize that despite continual injections of capital investment in the countryside, the situation nevertheless is not changing, so I wish to ask, what is your attitude to the law recently passed by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on priority supplies of equipment for agriculture. [passage omitted]

[Silayev] Thank you. I agree that the resolution passed by the Supreme Soviet is not fully in accord with the market approach, but given the situation we find ourselves in, in which those mechanisms have not yet been fully perfected, the Supreme Soviet had no other option than to go for that formula. I think that we will have to implement that decision, though we will build rather more courageous economic action into the program and budget for 1992.

[Khasbulatov] Microphone no. 3.

[(Manukhin)] Deputy (Manukhin) from Novosibirsk. Ivan Stepanovich, the second congress passed a decision on support for small farms. Your government correspondingly passed a resolution to make separate allocations of agricultural machinery for small farmers, but in practical terms that decision was not carried out in time for the sowing season. [passage omitted] How are you going to correct the situation?

[Silayev] Thank you. We examined this question literally just a few days ago. We had a meeting with the leaders of the Agrarian Small Farmers' Union, and agreed that at the end of next week we would hold a special meeting of the Presidium of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, at which we will not only examine and discuss the situation very closely, but also draw the appropriate conclusions.

[Khasbulatov] Number four, please.

[(Surkov)] People's Deputy (Surkov), Territorial Constituency No 40. Esteemed Ivan Stepanovich. We realize that the (Lokshin's) of this world, who are now lining up to act as proxies for Ryzhkov, in order to discredit our government, are prepared to seek out all possible means of, essentially, hampering its activity. In particular, we have gone out to the regions and seen the likes of (Lokshin) hampering the development, or the implementation, of our law on peasant and private farms. They have chosen a formula, according to which, if you leave to become a private farmer, you will have to land up in another cabal. You won't have any freedom: You will have to join an association of private farms, which is in the hands of the local nomenklatura, and only through that association will you be able to obtain anything.

My question to you is this: Can the government set up a genuine infrastructure through which private farmers can obtain the same equipment freely, in order to escape from the control of the (Lokshins) and their ilk? Thank you.

[Silayev] I thank you, too. The Russian Government's program to stabilize the economy and make the switch to market relations actually envisages the creation of just such structures.

[Khasbulatov] Microphone number 5.

[(Konstantinov)] (Konstantinov), Territorial Constituency No 774, Yaroslavl. Esteemed Ivan Stepanovich, you stated in your speech that the government has kept the interest on credits obtained up to 1 January 1991 at the existing rates. Please tell us of a document which sets out the standard rates, because when I spoke to the oblast office of the state bank today, they said that interest rates have been kept at the level of the presidential decree.

[Silayev] Thank you. Comrade Lazarev, the finance minister, is present here: There he is, in the front row. Try to find the opportunity in the interval, or somehow to go up to him, and he will tell you about that document setting out the standard rates.

[Khasbulatov] Number six, the last question.

[(Lavrushin)] Deputy (Lavrushin), Ulyanovsk Oblast. Ivan Stepanovich, you urge us to be patient. But we've no time for patience! The collective farmers' patience is exhausted, too. I have been a collective farm chairman for four years. (Lokshin) has worked for 30 years, but I support him fully, because it isn't the collective farmers who are taking the land. Who has taken the land in our district? The chief of the agriculture directorate has 50 hectares of it, and the main livestock specialist of the state farm, 30 hectares. The collective farmers aren't taking it. Just look. For two years we handed over our milk at 90 kopecks, with the subsidy. Now we are giving it up at 63 kopecks for the top grade, and 43 kopecks for the first grade, yet a bottle of lemonade costs 1.46 rubles. What sort of patience are you urging us to show? When are we going to have normal prices? You're talking about a market economy, while we have the plan and are handing milk over for 63 kopecks. When are we going to get a market economy?

[Silayev] Thank you. I don't understand your way of looking at the issue. Everything that I have said, the government intends to put into practice. I am absolutely convinced that if somebody else takes on the realization of this task, and invests 50 percent of national income in agriculture while leaving everything else without a single kopeck of finance, it would be the wrong approach. I urge that we should set about implementing the program together. Finally, I wish to say this: The government program was published and given to each member, each deputy, at the third congress. Unfortunately, the fewest proposals concerning that program came from agrarian deputies.

[Khasbulatov] Thank you, Ivan Stepanovich. [applause]

Status of CPSU Property Referendum Noted

91UN1576A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 20, May 91 p 2

["Topic of the Day" article by V. Savichev: "On CPSU Property"]

[Text] **A question about the president of Russia to which all RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] residents should respond may become the main, but not the only, question in elections scheduled for June: Democratic Russia has mounted an extensive campaign to collect signatures in favor of also placing on the election ballot the issue of holding an all-Russian referendum on nationalizing the property of the CPSU.**

After a failed attempt by the democrats to raise this issue at the all-Union level, some republics embarked on resolving it independently. It is already known what this has led to in the Baltic republics. So far, it is unknown what this plan will lead to in Armenia where, upon the adoption of a similar resolution, the Supreme Soviet of the republic has already "moved" to the building of the Communist Party of Armenia Central Committee, despite the presence of airborne assault units in Yerevan which, as is known, have arrived there to guard Ministry of Defense installations.

The property of the Communist Party is being nationalized in Georgia as well, where all of these processes are advancing without any excesses, incidentally, as well as in Armenia.

There is reason to believe that a lot will depend on the state of affairs in Russia, where the main stronghold of the communists is located, and where their positions are strong.

Under the Law on Referendums, an expression of the will of no fewer than 1 million RSFSR citizens is necessary for a referendum to be held in the republic.

Since it is expected that the issue of holding a referendum will be presented simultaneously with the election of the president of Russia, under the same law it is necessary to file the necessary lists containing the citizens' signatures at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet no later than 27 May inclusive.

Two action groups have been registered at this point, in Moscow and Leningrad, where all the information gathered is accumulated and processed. Democratic Russia chapters are engaged in efforts to collect signatures in many other cities of Russia, particularly Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk, Sakhalin, and so on; subsequently, the chapters send the signatures to Moscow and Leningrad.

As we were told at the headquarters of the action group in Leningrad, by 22 May about 150,000 signature sheets were fully processed, and about 800,000 more being worked on. About 400,000 signatures have been collected in Moscow. This number would not have been available had it not been for a stroke of luck by which the

documents survived an explosion at the Moscow headquarters of Democratic Russia which, as is known, occurred on 16 May. Several hundred signatures were sent to Leningrad from Sverdlovsk; judging by other reports, Russia will collect the required 1 million votes.

However, this is not yet to say that the Russian referendum on nationalizing the assets of the Communist Party will be held. Obviously, this is going to depend primarily on who becomes president of Russia.

The position of B. Yeltsin on this issue is known: Presumably, the law on the departyization of the life of Russian society will be among the first to be adopted. Similar decisions can hardly be expected of the second likeliest contender for this position, N. Ryzhkov.

Communists feel quite untroubled and confident in the existing situation, stating that their property is safely protected by the appropriate Law on Property. However, they have a much weightier argument in reserve—the Army, which has already shown many times that it is capable of protecting CPSU property more reliably than any law.

Western Republics

Ukraine's Kravchuk on Union Treaty Signing

OW3005061191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] The head of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, Leonid Kravchuk, has told IF [INTERFAX] during his tour of the Vinnitsa region that the Ukraine will insist that every article in the future Treaty of Union be worded clearly and unambiguously, primarily where the division of functions between the center and the republics is concerned. He protested in this connection against attempts by the center to encourage republics to sign the treaty in haste.

In his interview for Ukrainian TV Mr. Kravchuk said that before the Ukraine signed the Union Treaty it would have to take an important decision—notably, get all of its assets, such as land, natural resources, etc., under republican jurisdiction. "Only then should we proceed to draft a treaty reflecting the realities of life," Kravchuk said.

Asked during his meeting with workers at one of Vinnitsa's industrial plants to describe the mechanism of elections of the republic's president (as envisaged by the draft constitution approved in principle by the Ukranian parliament), Mr. Kravchuk said it would have to be a mechanism ruling out "yet another noisy campaign with a long list of names."

Ukrainian President Interviewed on 'Sovereignty'

PM2905152191 Paris LE MONDE in French 29 May 91 p 8

[Interview with Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk by Dominique Dhombres in Kiev; date not given—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Kiev—Ukranian Supreme Soviet Chairman Leonid Kravchuk is a moderate nationalist; he is currently one of Mr. Gorbachev's allies and is playing a subtle hand to try to secure greater autonomy for his republic. But he is floundering amid economic problems (industrial production has fallen by 5 percent since the beginning of the year) and political problems: There are 16 parties in the Ukraine, and, although they are not all officially "registered," our interlocutor is working on the basis of this new situation.

[Kravchuk] I think it is a good thing that there are several political parties. I am a member of the Ukrainian Communist Party. If that party wishes to recover and regain influence, it must do so by fighting the other parties and doing so openly before the people.

[Dhombres] Even through an election by direct universal suffrage?

[Kravchuk] Yes. The process is the following: We must first adopt the new constitution next January. Then, on that basis, we must draft an electoral law permitting a multiparty system. The election could be held in April or May 1992.

[Dhombres] Will it just be a presidential election or will there also be legislative elections?

[Kravchuk] Both will occur at the same time, but the situation could change at any time because of the risks of a serious political crisis. That is why it might be urgently necessary to consolidate the executive. In that case, we would just hold a presidential election with candidates from the different parties. We would have to adopt a law conferring full powers on the president. Russia is going to elect its president. The other republics are going to do likewise. In these conditions, to defend the Ukraine's interests we need a strong president elected by universal suffrage. I am opposed to the indirect election of the president by the Supreme Soviet. Only a president elected by universal suffrage can effectively defend our republic's interests. I hope to be president.

[Dhombres] What do you think of the Union treaty currently being negotiated by Moscow and the republics?

[Kravchuk] The process is very complex. I uphold the idea of a Union of sovereign states. If every republic delegates a fraction of its sovereignty to the "center" it should give up part of its powers in return. Otherwise it cannot work.

The essential problem is the distribution of power. In the draft agreement there are three areas of authority—

federal, republican, and joint. I am opposed to the existence of a joint sphere which would automatically lead to a conflict of authority.

An interesting situation has developed. Two years ago Mr. Gorbachev took the initiative of changing relations between the center and the republics. It was he who used the formula of a "Union of sovereign states." Then, under pressure from economic and political events, I think he curbed that process. I stress that he did not reject that process, but simply curbed it.

[Dhombres] When?

[Kravchuk] I think he did so six months ago when the situation in the Baltic republics became critical in September and October; since then there have been the events in Armenia and Moldavia. The question of whether to move forward or take a backward step has been raised.

[Dhombres] Do the powers delegated to the center concern mainly defense and security?

[Kravchuk] Yes. Strategic defense—the nuclear, air, and naval forces. I am opposed to the division of nuclear weapons. That could be the cause of great instability. Furthermore, I am personally opposed to those weapons. The declaration on Ukrainian sovereignty adopted last July indicates that our republic should be nuclear-free in the future. We must divide up areas of authority in such a way as to avoid damaging the balance in Europe and in the world.

[Dhombres] Will the Ukraine nonetheless have authority in the defense sphere?

[Kravchuk] We have the militia and the forces that come under the interior ministry's authority. The latter, although on our territory, are controlled by Moscow. We want them to come under Ukrainian authority from now on and to deal only with Ukrainian problems. These forces should not deal either with border security or with strategic defense questions.

[Dhombres] Is economic management the domain of the central authorities?

[Kravchuk] We are prepared to transfer our authority, notably in the space and transportation sphere. The center must only administer those areas delegated to it by the republic. Nothing more.

[Dhombres] In this connection, will the Donbass coalfields be administered by the Ukraine?

[Kravchuk] Yes, exclusively. The same is true for all the coal and metallurgical industries.

[Dhombres] Does the existence of a single currency throughout Soviet territory suit the Ukraine?

[Kravchuk] No, not at all. We are currently working to create a parallel currency. We think that there should be two kinds of currency—one federal and one republican. A national currency, in the absence of a convertible ruble, is necessary primarily to defend our internal market. Not against the West, but, unfortunately, against ourselves. We have not found any other solution. The republics that leave the Union will naturally be able to immediately have their own foreign currency system.

[Dhombres] What percentage of foreign currency does the republic have?

[Kravchuk] It is tiny. The enterprises only keep around 5 percent of the foreign currency they earn. All the rest is transferred to Moscow which then distributes those resources, and we constantly have to defend our share. I would like all the foreign currency earned in the Ukraine to remain in the Ukraine. Of course, if we delegate some powers to the center we will also have to contribute to their funding.

[Dhombres] Have the forces in favor of Ukrainian independence been weakened?

[Kravchuk] No, that is not the case, but I do not think they are decisive. There is a very strong majority in favor of Ukrainian sovereignty within the framework of the Soviet Union. But it must be a Union of sovereign states.

[Dhombres] What distinction do you draw between sovereignty and independence?

[Kravchuk] I do not draw a great distinction. When I use the term "independence" it means full independence. When I use the word "sovereignty" I am thinkimg of the notion of the delegation of powers.

[Dhombres] Do you think that Mr. Gorbachev will still be president in five years' time?

[Kravchuk] The situation in this sphere is very difficult. For instance, I support Mr. Gorbachev. I discussed this question with my colleagues during the Central Committee plenum (in April—LE MONDE editor's note) when there was talk of calling for his resignation. I told them that that would be a very serious mistake. It would have been necessary to choose a candidate who opposes Mr. Gorbachev's policy. A majority of party members, notably the intelligentsia, would then have followed Mr. Gorbachev. The only people who would have remained in the party would have been retired people and members of the apparatus living at the party's expense.... The tragedy of Mr. Gorbachev is that he has to carry all the shortcomings of Soviet life. If elections were held today, I am not sure that he would be elected although he is greatly valued throughout the world.

[Dhombres] What is the state of relations with France?

[Kravchuk] We have a tradition of good relations with France. Only Poland perhaps can claim to have such longstanding ties as we do—we who gave France a queen (Footnote) (Anne of Kiev married Henri I of France in 1051). Recently those ties have been developed with the opening of a consulate general. I understand that France's policy is based on the continuation of its

relations with the Soviet Union and with Mr. Gorbachev, and we are not asking Paris to change its position. We want people over there to know that the Ukraine exists too. We want France simultaneously to have relations with the Ukraine which are not harmful to the Soviet Union.

[Dhombres] What will your republic be called?

[Kravchuk] The Ukraine! Nothing else! Not the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Epithets pass, the Ukraine remains.

Caucasus

Gamsakhurdia on USSR Internal Troops Excesses

AU2905135191 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 17 May 91 p 1

[Message from Georgian President Z. Gamsakhurdia to USSR Internal Affairs Minister B. Pugo in Tbilisi on 16 May]

[Text] On 13 May, a USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs unit, deployed in the town of Tskhinvali, making "raids" outside the former South Ossetian Autonomous Region, rushed into the village of Disevi and, as the villagers looked on, tore off and desecrated the Georgian national banner hanging from a school building.

The units entrusted to you that have repeatedly oppressed civilians, stolen their property and cattle, and committed other disgraceful acts have now gone so far as to insult the honor and dignity of the entire Georgian people.

We demand that the excesses being committed by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs forces be stopped and the servicemen involved in the violations of public order and law be made answerable for them.

[signed] Zviad Gamsakhurdia, President of the Republic of Georgia.
16 May 1991.
Tbilisi.

Yazov Rules Out International Forces in NKAO

LD2905212391 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Despite numerous promises, the center is clearly incapable of solving the Nagorno-Karabakh [NKAO] problem, and now the possibility is seriously being discussed of bringing in UN forces to keep the peace.

[Correspondent I. Kukin] A group of delegates from the first international Sakharov conference from the United States, Great Britain, Japan and Norway, headed by the speaker of the British House of Lords, Baroness Caroline Cox, visited Nagorno-Karabakh. They were shaken by what they saw there, and they saw many things. Lady Caroline herself, walking through Nagorno-Karabakh, literally with a white flag, was able to meet representatives of both sides.

After their return, the group met Marshal Yazov and discussed the Karabakh problem with him. In the words of Baroness Caroline Cox, however, Marshal Yazov stated that, although he has not yet consulted with Gorbachev, he unambiguously believesthat there can be no question of the participation of international armed forces, or even the creation of a civil independent commission with the participation of independent experts.

Armenian Party Leaders Favor Union Treaty

LD2905210291 Moscow TASS in English 2014 GMT 29 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan May 29 TASS—Armenian Communist Party leaders held a news conference here today devoted to the results of talks in Moscow between delegations of the Armenian and Azerbaijani communist parties and their meeting with President Mikhail Gorbachev, who is also Soviet Communist Party leader.

Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Aram Sarkisyan said the party believes that problems of Nagorno-Karabakh can be resolved through the region's participation in a Union treaty and giving it the rights of a subject of the federation.

Despite the fact that meetings in Moscow concerned only the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh, other issues were also discussed during the news conference.

Sarkisyan confirmed the Armenian Communist Party's position concerning the republic's participation in a Union treaty. "We consider the signing of a Union treaty by Armenia as a stage in the process of reaching national independence. We believe that the treaty should be signed," Sarkisyan said.

"If we want to help Nagorno-Karabakh, we should not refuse to participate in a Union treaty. Such a refusal would be a mistake," said another participant in Moscow talks Azat Yegiazaryan, a member of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee.

The Armenian Communist Party's Yerevan City Committee leader Sergey Badalyan believes that Armenia should sign a Union treaty. "If we think about our people's security and its future. At the same time we should develop direct contacts with Union republics and foreign countries".

Badalyan said there is contradiction between Armenia's refual to sign a Union treaty and a referendum on the republic's secession from the Soviet Union, scheduled for September 21.

"If the republic refuses to sign a Union treaty, does it need to hold a referendum. Where should it secede from?" Badalyan said. He said that "after a new treaty is signed, a new Union will be formed, and we will find ourselves outside it".

Sarkisyan confirmed the Armenian Communist Party's firm refusal to resolve any issues connected wit it, by force.

Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan's Independence Day Speech

NC2905114291 Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network in Armenian 1730 GMT 28 May 91

[Speech by Armenian Supreme Soviet Chairman Levon Ter-Petrosyan at a rally marking the anniversary of Armenian independence in Yerevan on 28 May—recorded]

[Text] Dear compatriots, [words indistinct] our people are today celebrating the anniversary of the restoration of Armenian statehood on 28 May 1918. That was a difficult and tragic time for the Armenian people, far more difficult than anything we are experiencing now. While it is true we are (?living through) difficult days today, they cannot be compared with the situation that existed when independent Armenian statehood was created. It may seem that the independent Armenian republic was a mere flash in the pan, as it only lasted for two and a half years; however, those two and a half years had a decisive impact on the Armenian people. Had there not been these two and a half years of independence, then there would have been no Soviet Armenia, no strong republic of three and a half million who are building the foundations of their new new statehood. More than anything else, we owe our survival and our current decisive struggle for freedom and independence to those two and one-half years.

Independence day is not a holiday to be celebrated with flowers, drums, and [words indistinct]; on the contrary, independence requires hard work and resolute struggle and, unfortunately, it is accompanied by martyrs as well as by ideas. No nation has ever been able to (?uphold) its independence and freedom without ideas and martyrs. Independence in itself is not the purpose of existence; rather, freedom is man's essential right. God brings each man into the world as a free man, and it is only after he enters this world that he is enslaved by the laws of the world. No individual can be free unless his nation is free. A nation is made up of individuals, and as long as the nation is not free its component individuals cannot be fully free. Freedom is the sole condition for the happiness and (?well-being) of any individual and people.

We seek our independence and are proceeding toward it. We will struggle for this independence in the name of the freedom, happiness, and well-being of our people.

Long live free and independent Armenia, long live the freedom of the Armenian people. The Armenian people have the right to happiness and they should be happy. They will show the world that they have this right and force the world to respect this right. Long live the Armenian people.

Armenian MVD Warns of Effort To Incite Clashes

NC2905113391 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1830 GMT 28 May 91

[Statement issued by the Armenian Republic's Internal Affairs Ministry (MVD); place and date not given]

[Text] We are all concerned about the tense situation prevailing in the republic. The criminal operations conducted by the Azerbaijani guerrillas, the Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia Detachment, the Soviet Army, and the internal troops in Armenia's border regions, Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast], Shaumyanovskiy Rayon, and Getashen have generated justified anger and indignation.

Today we are presented with a new danger. Those forces that have consistently sought to poison and (?disrupt) the peaceful life of the republic are now trying to cause friction between our people and the Army deployed in Armenia and to provoke new clashes and tension. They are attempting to use young people and unstable elements in their conspiracy, inciting them to take provocative actions. These efforts have been concentrated in Echmiadzinskiy Rayon, but have also surfaced in other regions.

The Internal Affairs Ministry calls on all the inhabitants of the republic to exercise caution and to (?resist) provocations.

Mutalibov's Azerbaijani 'Revival' Day Statement

LD2905084291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 28 May 91

[Statement by Azerbaijani President Ayaz Niyaz ogly Mutalibov on the "Azerbaijani day of national revival" in Baku on 28 May—recorded]

[Text] Today's celebration of the revival of Azerbaijan statehood by all the peoples and workers of the republic is, first of all, an event of very great political and social significance. This celebration lifts the veil over the history of Azerbaijan's white spots. On the whole, this is a rather remarkable event. At the same time, however, this holiday is being celebrated in an atmosphere of continuing tension in the region.

Unfortunately, the destructive forces that, against the common sense, are still building up their positions. This, in principle, saddens us because we are peaceful people and want peaceful coexistence with all the nations and peoples living in Azerbaijan. This is an ancient tradition of our people and of our republic. This is our natural way of living. What is unnatural is that some people hope to influence public opinion in the country and make people believe that the Azerbaijani cannot get along with the

Armenians, that they do not want a peaceful coexistence. We oppose such claims and are happy that public opinion, in principle, in the country, as well as in the world, is already getting clear on this point. Today, this view is no longer shared. At the same time, I would like to say that, even on this festive day, we intend to protect our statehood, our sovereignity, and territorial integrity. These are the hopes and the wishes of all the Azerbaijani people.

Central Asia

Gorbachev's First Day in Kazakhstan Reported

PM2805224091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Report by unnamed PRAVDA and TASS special correspondents: "USSR President in Kazakhstan"]

[Text] Kokchetav—USSR President M.S. Gorbachev began a working visit to Kazakhstan yesterday, 28 May. His first stop was in the north of the republic, in the city of Kokchetav.

M.S. Gorbachev was met at the airport by Kazakhstan President N.A. Nazarbayev and other leaders of the republic and oblast.

At the oblast center M.S. Gorbachev laid flowers on the V.I. Lenin Memorial. A brief meeting with inhabitants of the city took place on the square. Mikhail Sergeyevich visited a Kokchetav store and then made a tour around the oblast.

M.S. Gorbachev was in the Kazakhstan virgin lands in the fall of 1985. Then the farmers were harvesting grain. Today sowing is under way. The grain growers concerns are very familiar to the president: His career path started in the cereal fields. For that reason every aspect of the farmers' life and work was of interest to Mikhail Sergeyevich during his meetings with machine operators.

A meeting with leaseholders and party and soviet workers was held at a field camp of the "Niva" leasehold collective on the "Zlatopolskiy" Sovkhoz [state farm]. A committed discussion about the economic and social development of farms in the Kazakhstan virgin lands took place during the conversation.

M.S. Gorbachev familiarized himself with progress in construction in the countryside, enquired about farmers' living conditions, and visited stores and a consumer services center.

The people of Kokchetav are widely applying various forms of economic management, acting on the principle that all methods of work organization are fine if you want to achieve good output results.

A.Ya. Garder and the members of his team have made a substantial contribution to the overall success. The collective has grown first-class seed grain on their 6,000 hectares. Each worker produces output worth 60,000 rubles [R]. The team has its own bank account and more than R900,000 on deposit. People feel themselves to be fully in charge of the land.

...Leaseholders, private farmers, cooperative members, and leaders of the oblast rayons had assembled at this team's field camp on the day of the USSR president's arrival. Discussion was committed and useful.

The people present spoke about the advantages of working in the new way and about the sector's development prospects and its problems. The issue of equipment for the countryside was keenly raised.

"Is it really right," they said indignantly, "when T-4 tractors arrive without cabs or fuel tanks. The famous "Kirov" tractors arrive defective and sowing machines lack important components. Farmers think more attention should be paid to agricultural workers and their needs."

Summing up the results of the visit, M.S. Gorbachev noted that it is essential to be bold in reforming relations in all spheres of the economy. And all of us must do this together, combining socialism with people's interests. It is important to return people to ownership. The command system has become obsolete. It excludes enterprise and competition in the best sense of the term. Otherwise you get not a society, but a "social security department."

"You," he said, turning to the assembly, "have set about this task and have seen for yourselves that things are moving. This is also happening in industry. After all, even the Kama Truck Plant is now a leaseholding operation."

M.S. Gorbachev wished the participants in the meeting new successes.

The USSR president is accompanied on his trip by V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, USSR first deputy prime minister, and V.I. Chernoivanov, USSR minister of agriculture and food.

A detailed account of the progress of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's working visit can be read in the next issue.

Visit Fulfills 'Long-Standing' Promise

PM2905191991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 May 91 First Edition p 1

[TASS-KAZTAG special correspondents' report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Stay in Kokchetav"]

[Excerpts] Kokchetav (Kazakh SSR) [Soviet Socialist Republic]), 28 May—M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived here today. [passage omitted]

On the way from the airport the guest was warmly greeted by the inhabitants of Kokchetav. During stops they put questions to the president on the progress of

preparations for the Union treaty, the situation in the country, and ways out of the economic crisis, and spoke about their affairs.

Replying to journalists' questions about the reason for his arrival in Kazakhstan, M.S. Gorbachev said that he is fulfilling a long-standing promise to visit the republic. Kazakhstan occupies a prominent place in the country's economy. The republic's people are doing a great deal to strengthen our multinational state.

On V.I. Lenin Square the USSR president laid flowers at the monument to the founder of the Soviet state. A meeting with labor and Great Patriotic War veterans was also held there.

M.S. Gorbachev visited the "Sinegorye" cooperative store which is one of the biggest in the republic. Its trading area covers 570 square meters, and the annual retail trade turnover exceeds 4.5 million rubles [R].

There is a varied range of agricultural products on display on the shelves. Pedantic Moscow guests counted nine varieties of smoked sausage and as many varieties of cooked sausage. There is no shortage of other products on the shelves. The prices are cooperative prices.

Is this abundance in honor of the visit?—we asked customers.

No. There are no problems here with trade. What we produce is to be found on the shelves.

Kokchetav Oblast is one of the republic's main grain baskets, obtaining the most stable harvest on the virgin lands. Its economy is developing through meat and dairy farming.

A characteristic example is the Dzhamantuzskoye Rayon specialized farm association. Suffice it to say that last year 707 tonnes of meat were procured here, and net profit totaled around R1.3 million.

M.S. Gorbachev arrived here in the afternoon. He visited the family of leasehold collective team leader N.V. Moiseyev. They and 26 other families of farm workers and specialists live in spacious, well-appointed houses. In time, all the village inhabitants will have such housing.

In conversation with the team leader the USSR president inquired about the state of affairs in the leasehold collective. He expressed approval for the new form of management applied by the villagers. [passage omitted]

Farmers Discuss New Methods

PM2905191191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 91 First Edition p 1

[G. Dildyayev, T. Yesilbayev, A. Nikitin, and V. Ryzhkov report: "Meetings in Kazakhstan. Working Visit of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev Is Continuing"]

[Text] At the Kokchetav "Zlatopolskiy" Sovkhoz [state farm] he [Gorbachev] familiarized himself with the labor organization. All the 111 collectives on this farm are leasehold collectives with their own bank accounts.

Meanwhile, in the neighboring Kustanay Oblast, N.A. Nazarbayev, president of Kazakhstan, noted, there is a similar leasehold sovkhoz which is no longer headed by a director, but by a leaseholders' council.

The farmers talked about their approach toward the new ways. It was noted that, ultimately, it is not always money that is needed, but also other psychological incentives. M.S. Gorbachev, learning that by no means all the leaseholders have acquired bank accounts, said that they are no bureaucratic trifle, and that it is they that ultimately give entrepreneurs a sense of autonomy.

Of course, M.S. Gorbachev noted, it is easier to follow the beaten track. Why make a secret of it, many communists are not ready for the new ways. An in-depth restructuring of the very essence of party work is necessary. We are fond of saying: Society is not a social security office. Nonetheless, party committees have become adept at taking part in distribution and the elaboration of guidelines. Meanwhile life has changed key, as people here put it.

The president's conversation with virgin land farmers was frank and useful. During the past years of the perestroyka changes have taken place in this region.

It is a special region, with its famous history, its own-brand soil-conservation farming system, and its specific problems. The role of the virgin lands has been interpreted differently at different times. This can even be judged by the way the grain output records of the Kazakh crop farmers were feted. Toasts were proclaimed, orders gleamed on the heroes' jackets.

It does not make sense to question the importance of this vast region. Apart from outstanding victories, its history contains also quite a few mistakes. They got carried away here with the excessive plowing up of land.

Today, many sovkhozes have by themselves, without prompting from above, reviewed the structure of the sowings. Will the wheat river not grow shallow as a result of this?

At the spring council of team leaders we decided not to decrease grain production, Ch. Abutalipov, chairman of the Kokchetav Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies and first secretary of the party obkom, told us.

During the president's working tour of the oblast, virgin land machine operators also raised questions concerning the quality of agricultural machinery.

This is a very important problem, the president noted. The government is considering several options for resolving it, so as to take account of the interests of producers and consumers.

But there is another problem: Even buying expensive agricultural equipment has become extremely difficult.

Today every sovkhoz director is resolving these problems in his own way. Most often by means of barter: I give you grain, you give me a combine, timber, nails, and cement. But there are also other examples. The "Salkynkolskiy" Sovkhoz sold its grain for hard currency, which was then sold at an auction for 7 million rubles. The farm invested this money in KamAZ and Minsk Tractor joint-stock enterprises. The sovkhoz secured the delivery of 12 trucks and 10 tractors annually, and a high rate of annual income...

Political problems are closely intervowen with problems of the social development of the countryside. The president's profound and versatile interest in the life and day-to-day concerns of the virgin land farmers was evident in particular at the Dzhamantuzskoye rayon specialized farm association. A model village is being built there. Mikhail Sergeyevich and Raisa Maksimovna took a walk down the long village road, they called at the store and the consumer service center, and paid a visit to team leader V. Moiseyev. He has a beautiful house, just like many of his fellow villagers. By no means all people in the virgin lands are living in such comfortable small houses today.

USSR President M.S. Gorbachev left by air for Chimkent 29 May.

Gorbachev Travels to Chimkent 29 May

Meets Farmers

LD2905214591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 29 May 91

[Video report by correspondent S. Lomakin from Chimkent Oblast—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrived in Chimkent Oblast today. The USSR president was met at the airport by leaders of the oblast. [Video shows Gorbachev, followed by Raisa and Nazarbayev descending aircraft steps and being met by local officials]

Within exactly five minutes the motorcade was halted by the townspeople wanting to shake the hand of the head of state. There is nothing suprising in such a warm welcome, because Mikhail Sergeyevich's arrival has been awaited here for a long time. In virtually all the years the Soviet state has been in existence, this is the first time a leader of the country has visited the oblast. [passage omitted]

The first meeting was with the vegetable-growing team of the Imeni 21-go Partsyezda state farm in Abayskiy Rayon. It is a lease-holding team with over 80 hectares of land and it cultivates nine kinds of vegetables. It is family teams who work here—there are six of them—and on the whole each member of the family has one hectare of land. [passage omitted]

Incidentally, the problem of supplying the population of the oblast with vegetables has been solved. They can be bought in the shops at practically any time of the year. And the prices are relatively accessible. [passage omitted] [video shows shots of wheat fields and Gorbachev shaking hands with group of farmers]

[Gorbachev, addressing one of the farmers] Well, what kind of a lease-holder are you? You have the land; do you have the equipment?

[Farmer] Yes.

[Gorbachev] It is given to you on a contract basis?

[Farmer] Yes.

[Gorbachev] Do you have an account at your bank?

[Farmer] No, but I have my own checkbook.

[Gorbachev] You have your own checkbook? Well, that's a first step. [points to another man in group] Does the director give you the right to have a bank account? [laughter]

[Farmer] (?I don't have any complaints about them.)

[Gorbachev] There are no obstacles?

[Farmer] No.

[Gorbachev] They support you?

[Farmer] Yes. [words indistinct]

[Gorbachev] What sort of income did you earn last year?

[Farmer] Seventy-four thousand.

[Gorbachev] Seventy-four thousand? This is for distribution between... [changes thought] or overall?

[Farmer] Overall.

[Gorbachev] But what if everything is reckoned up, so much is paid to the state farm, so much for the fuel, what is left for the wages?

[Farmer] We are left with 2,000 each.

[Gorbachev] Two thousand each?

[Farmer] Yes.

[Gorbachev] And per month. How much do you reckon you get, taking into account the advance and the final sum?

[Farmer] Two hundred plus, each.

[Gorbachev] Two hundred rubles. That's not much.

[Lomakin] This is the explanation given in the countryside. Prices for equipment, fuel, and building materials have jumped four to five times, but purchase prices for

food have no more than doubled. So it turns out that no matter how hard you work, the expenditure on production is not covered.

So, one more unplanned stop. Mikhail Sergeyevich was unable to pass the wheatfields quietly. The beloved wheat was too inviting. The heart of the wheat farmer was roused; his youth in Stavropol region came back.

[Gorbachev] When the harvest begins, I just cannot sit in the office. I just have to come! [passage omitted]

[Lomakin] Following the chronology of the day, the next meeting was with a team of shepherd farmers at the (Burzharskiy) state farm. And the president's attention was drawn to a portable Japanese Yamaha power generator. And why not, the shepherds of today cannot get by without a freezer, a television set, and other electrical appliances.

Mikhail Sergeyevich was interested in the shepherds' working and living conditions. Why hide it, not many young people are attracted to this work today.

In the second half of the day the country's president visited the Chimkent tire plant. This is one of the biggest enterprises in the oblast. It produces tires for trucks and light cars. [passage omitted] [video shows Gorbachev and entourage touring the plant] [passage omitted]

Farming Methods Detailed

LD2905175391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1651 GMT 29 May 91

[TASS-KAZTAG special correspondent's report]

[Text] Chimkent, 29 May (TASS)—Continuing his trip to Kazakhstan, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev arrived in Chimkent today from Kokchetav. The work program for the second day of his stay in the republic demonstrated the intention of the head of state to continue getting acquainted with the state of affairs in the agrarian state.

In this context Chimkent Oblast is an interesting subject. Here there are rather favorable conditions for conducting agriculture. But the main thing is that the agricultural workers in Chimkent Oblast are active supporters of new forms of internal economic relations. State cooperative and production-leasing associations have been set up here, together with associations and unions of peasant farms. The 250 independent peasant farms are becoming more and more strongly established. Many of the farmers have already returned the loans which they took from the state and are ready to buy out equipment and buildings using their own resources. The first peasant bank, financing dozens of farming economies, has appeared in the republic.

The work and concerns of peasant-leasers, their successors and problems, became the main topic of the conversations between them and Mikhail Gorbachev. He noted that the new forms of farming are chiefly valuable in having awoken initiative in the worker; they are resulting in high yields and greater productivity for the state. In other words, complete compatibility is being obtained of personal and state interests.

In the evening the USSR president, having completed his familiarization in Chimkent Oblast, arrived in Alma-Ata.

Hears Farmers Concerns

PM2905220591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Special correspondents G. Dildyayev, T. Yesilbayev, A. Nikitin, and V. Ryzhkov report: "Meetings in Kazakhstan. Working Visit of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev Is Continuing"]

[Text] Chimkent Oblast, 29 May—M.S. Gorbachev arrived in Chimkent at a far from auspicious moment. The weather has badly disappointed the inhabitants of Chimkent Oblast. The early spring was very dry, and then in the middle of May heavy rains set in which have persisted, with brief interruptions, until the last few days.

The USSR president began his acquaintance with the oblast in Abayskiy Rayon at the suburban sovkhoz [state farm] named for the 21st party congress. The farm specializes in the production of vegetables, dispatching more than 8,000 tonnes daily of vitamin-rich produce to the inhabitants of Chimkent. There was a brief stop on a vegetable plantation assigned to S. Zhakibayev's leasehold team.

The introduction of the new forms of management in the countryside has freed peasants and enhanced their material interest in the end results of their labor. A. Zulpiyev, a leaseholder at the State-and-Cooperative Association named for S.M. Kirov in Bugunskiy Rayon, spoke about this.

Quite a few family farms have appeared recently in Chimkent Oblast. How many of them are there in the republic? We put this question to V. Anufriyev, second secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, while still on the aircraft.

There are some 1,600 now.

And leaseholders?

Considerably more than family farms.

Incidentally, no one is chasing figures here, the introduction (in the old sense of the word) of new forms of management is not being forced. It is a voluntary affair. Only awareness of the essence of privatization, psychological readiness for it, and a clear understanding of its advantages are kindling people's interest in it. But it is necessary for party and soviet organs to give them assistance, to be attentive to these complex and sometimes contradictory processes.

Acute topics were raised in heated discussions and arguments. Here is one of them—why did the president not include a visit to Karaganda in his itinerary, in order to meet miners and metal workers?

Frankly speaking, M.S. Gorbachev replied, Karaganda was included in the itinerary of this visit. But it had to be curtailed. I have decided to visit that city separately, to allocate at least two days to the visit, so as to be able to talk to the workers exhaustively, to answer their questions, and meantime to visit the fields. I cannot sit in my office when the groundwork for the harvest is being laid....

The concerns of livestock breeders did not escape M.S. Gorbachev's attention either. Visiting the "Burzharskiy" sheep raising sovkhoz [state farm], the USSR president met shepherd N. Ordabekov.

There were also other encounters during which a number of wishes connected with leading the country out of the economic crisis and strengthening legality, discipline, and order were put to the head of state.

At the oblast center M.S. Gorbachev visited the "Chimkent-Shina" Association, which is one of the biggest in Kazakhstan. The disruption of economic ties between republics has hit its economy particularly hard: After all, it receives virtually all its raw materials from other parts of the country. Over the first five months of the current year alone, suppliers have failed to deliver to the enterprise 14 million rubles' [R] worth of rubber, metal and textile cord, zinc oxide, and other materials. This did not fail to leave its mark—the association's output has decreased by R30 million. Yet Chimkent provides the "shoes" for cars, trucks, agricultural machinery, and tractors.

Some people's accounts caused the president joy, others made him reflect. Many things were put to the inhabitants of Chimkent Oblast to judge. Taking part in this were members of the government of the republic and the country who have arrived with Mikhail Sergeyevich in southern Kazakhstan. People saw that their voice does not go unanswered.

In the evening M.S. Gorbachev and N.A. Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], who is accompanying him on his trip, left Chimkent for Alma-Ata.

Gorbachev Arrives in Alma-Ata; Agenda Cited

LD2905175891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1454 GMT 29 May 91

[Text] Alma-Ata, 29 May (TASS)—TASS correspondent Konstantin Borodinov: USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev arrived in the capital of Kazakhstan this evening.

Despite the late hour, the visitor was warmly welcomed at the airport and along his route by thousands of city-dwellers and people who had come in from nearby villages. Many carried bouquets, flags of Kazakhstan and the USSR, and banners and streamers. Among the banners and streamers were obviously unusual ones with requests and direct appeals to the country's president: to revise prices downwards and to prevent the resumption of nuclear tests on Kazakhstan's soil.

Writer Olzhas Suleymenov, chairman of the antinuclear movement, made an appeal in the local press today to the peoples and the government of Kazakhstan to put an end to the activity of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test range, which is located on the republic's territory.

Meetings with the country's president are eagerly awaited by workers of the city's enterprises and peasants from villages near Kazakhstan's capital. In particular, a meeting between the country's president and textile workers is planned for tomorrow. In the afternoon there will be a businesslike discussion of vital problems of public and economic life with the republic's ideological and economic aktiv.

The problems are growing in Kazakhstan, where representatives of more than 100 nations and ethnic groups live, although a high degree of stability is maintained. Republic President Nursultan Nazarbayev is making the maximum effort to consolidate all progressive forces of society to resolve the problems. Entrepreneurs and academics have been offered jobs as consultants on privatization of state property and on transition to the market. Direct economic and cultural ties are being established between Kazakhstan and China, Turkey, the DPRK, and South Korea; and a number of joint enterprises to produce complex computer equipment and consumer goods have already been formed.

Explains Resignation Talk

LD3005151891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1422 GMT 30 May 91

[Excerpts] Alma-Ata, 30 May (TASS)—The first glimmers of political agreement between the main political forces have appeared in the USSR, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev has stated.

The Soviet leader spoke today at a meeting of the aktiv of Kazakhstan—the second largest union republic in the USSR. [passage omitted]

Speaking about the fact that he had recently raised the question of resigning from the post of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the head of the Soviet state explained that this was dictated by the fact that he "cannot agree with those currents within the party which want to turn us back." He expressed the opinion that the new CPSU program will become a base "upon which the party will finally define itself." "This is a progressive program within the framework of the socialist choice, but open for broad and deep processes within the party itself." It would be the greatest victory "if upon the base of the new program we achieved the rallying and the unity of the party and avoided a split," Mikhail Gorbachev stressed. [passage omitted]

With this speech, Mikhail Gorbachev ended his stay in Kazakhstan."

Speaks of Entering 'New Life'

LD3005141391 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 30 May 91

[Text] Alma-Ata May 30 TASS—"The first glimmer of political accord between the main political forces has appeared in the USSR," said President Mikhail Gorbachev.

He spoke today at a meeting of senior government and party officials and economic managers of the Kazakh SSR, the second largest Soviet republic.

Gorbachev noted that "the country has approached very drastic and steep changes, the change in the system of economic and political ways of life, the ways of life in the multi-ethnic state." Gorbachev pointed out the importance of switching to actions. The time of discussions, meetings and demands is past, "we should now enter this new life," Gorbachev said.

He noted that the "situation in the country has changed significantly virtually before one's own eyes." According to Gorbachev, the spring of 1991 spelled a very serious complication of the situation. Actually, March-April put the entire country on the brink of social upheavals.

At the same time, Gorbachev noted that the awareness of this fact by society "energised powerful mechanisms of self-preservation", which, in turn, prompted the way out of the crisis.

"It seems to me that the glimmer of social accord between all main political forces, the awareness that further confrontation is not supported by the absolute majority of Soviet people has emerged this spring," Gorbachev said.

Semipalatinsk Range To Be Reprofiled

LD3005150191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1415 GMT 30 May 91

[Text] Alma-Ata, 30 May (TASS)—On his visit to Kazakhstan, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev has revealed that the Soviet leadership plans to reprofile the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing range into a scientific research center.

Answering questions from the participants in the meeting, the Soviet leader recalled that nuclear tests have not been carried out at this testing range for one and a half years. "We have a plan to reprofile this testing range and turn it into a scientific research center," Mikhail Gorbachev said. "We shall do everything to avoid a blast at this testing range," he continued. At the same time the USSR president pointed out that "if the situation requires this we will limit ourselves exclusively to one or two tests."